Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-110
Thursday
7 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-110 *7 June 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

TASS Notes Missile Reduction Initiative 1
Shevardnadze Views Arms Control, U.S. Ties *[MOSCOW NEWS No 21]* 1
Foreign Ministry Spokesman on Arms Control *[TASS]* 2
Abandonment of Deterrence Strategy Justified *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Jun]* 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Events Surrounding Warsaw Pact Meeting in Moscow 4
Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Arrives *[Prague Radio]* 4
GDR Prime Minister Arrives *[East Berlin ADN]* 4
Hungarian Premier Arrives *[Budapest Radio]* 4
Jaruzelski on Meeting Expectations *[Warsaw Radio]* 4
Havel Meets With Goncz, Jaruzelski *[Prague Radio]* 4
TASS Notes Agenda of Meeting 4
Commentator Previews Pact Meeting *[Moscow International]* 5
Warsaw Pact Meeting Opens *[TASS]* 5
Pact Defense Ministers To Meet Mid-June *[TASS]* 5
Bloc Military Historians Hold Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jun]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports CSCE Meeting Proceedings 7
Gerasimov States NATO Is 'Obsolete' *[BBC TV]* 7
UN Contributions to Peace, Security Examined *[TASS]* 8
Yakovlev Addresses Investment Conference in Moscow *[Moscow TV]* 8
Petrovskiy Receives Helsinki Rights Officials *[TASS]* 9
Petrovskiy Receives Australian, Indian Envoys *[IZVESTIYA 26 May]* 9
World Peace Council Officials Interviewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 May]* 9
International Oil Conference Held in Moscow *[Moscow Radio]* 13
International Lenin Peace Prize Committee Set Up *[Moscow Radio]* 13

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reportage, Commentary Continue on Gorbachev Visit 14
Comparison of Meeting With Businessmen 14
Comparison of 1 Jun Dinner Speech 14
Commentary Praises Visit *[Moscow International]* 14
IZVESTIYA Cites Baker, U.S. Press [7 Jun] 14
Petrovskiy on Shevardnadze-Baker Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 15
Scant Foreign Steps to Aid Economy Hit *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 15
Zagladin Views U.S.-Soviet Talks on Germany *[Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG 3-4 Jun]* 17
Colonel Criticizes Global Shield Exercise *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 May]* 17
Space Experiment on Ozone Layer Planned *[TASS]* 18
San Francisco Group Invites Supsov Deputies *[TASS]* 18
Official on Soviet-U.S. Humanitarian Cooperation *[TASS]* 19
An-225 Planned for Display in Oklahoma *[Moscow International]* 19
Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Ontario *[TASS]* 20

Delegation Continues Canadian Tour *[TASS]* 20
Canadian Warships Arrive in Vladivostok *[TASS]* 20

Northeast Asia

DPRK 'Reaction' to Gorbachev-No Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 20
Army Workers Party Visit to DPRK Summed Up *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 May]* 21
Mongolian Democratic Party Officially Recognized *[TASS]* 21
Biryukova Views Lessons of Japanese Industry *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* 21
Article on Japanese 'Northern Territories' Issue *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 June]* 23
Japanese Fishing Crews To Stand Trial in Nakhodka *[Tokyo KYODO]* 24
Japan's Oita Prefecture Seeks 'Direct Ties' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 June]* 24
Kalinin Views Okinawa's Reversion Anniversary *[Moscow International]* 24

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Addresses UN Meeting in Bangkok *[TASS]* 25
Meets Thai Officials *[TASS]* 26
Commentary on Sen-Sihanouk Communique in Tokyo *[Moscow International]* 26
Vietnam's Nguyen Van Linh Meets With Ambassador *[TASS]* 27

East Europe

Czechoslovakia's Havel Meets Yeltsin in Moscow *[Prague Radio]* 27
Hungarian Socialist Party Congress Viewed *[PRAVDA 28 May]* 27
Congress Discusses Party's Tasks *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 27
New Hungarian Premier's Program Aims Reported
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 May] 28
Ryzhkov Condolences to Romania on Earthquake *[TASS]* 28
USSR-Polish Illegal Border Crossings Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 29

West Europe

Ligachev Studies Cooperatives in Stockholm *[TASS]* 29
Italy's Andreotti on Gorbachev's U.S. Visit *[TASS]* 29
PRAVDA's Frolov Receives Irish Delegation *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 30

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Shcherbakov: 35-40 Million Jobless Possible *[Moscow TV]* 31
Pavlov Discusses Tax Rates, Rationale *[Moscow TV]* 31
Committee Refutes 'Radiactive Cloud' Story *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 32
KYODO: Some Siberian Air Routes Closed 32
Government Presidium Debates Press, Customs Code *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]* 33
Yakovlev Chairs Commission on Repressions *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Yazov Awards Prizes to Authors *[TASS]* 33
Medvedev Attends Cinematographers Union Congress *[PRAVDA 6 Jun]* 34
Vlasov, Others Mark Centennial of Chuvash Poet *[PRAVDA 6 Jun]* 34
Obituary of Former Leader V.V. Kuznetsov *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 34
Laptev Views Gorbachev-Yeltsin Relationship *[Hamburg DIE WELT 6 Jun]* 35

Economic

CPSU Plenum May Discuss New Economic Plan *[Moscow Radio]* 35
Albalkin on Importance of Market Reform *[Moscow Radio]* 35
Yarin: Market Reforms Implementation Impossible *[Moscow International]* 36
AUCCTU Chief Urges Social Protection Measures *[TASS]* 36
Independent TU Council Disagrees on Market Switch *[Moscow Radio]* 37
Trade Unions Respond to Market Proposals *[TRUD 31 May]* 37

Odessa Plant Output Affected by Poor Deliveries *[Moscow TV]* 38
Gold Miners Fear Market, Seek New Terms *[Moscow TV]* 38
Ministry Plans To Export Planes, Helicopters *[Moscow International]* 39

Agricultural

Ligachev Chairs CPSU Agrarian Commission *[Moscow Radio]* 39
TASS Report 39
PRAVDA Account *[6 Jun]* 39
Advantages of Land Sale Argued *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]* 41

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic Council Meets in Latvia *[Moscow TV]* 43
Sends Telegram to Gorbachev *[TASS]* 43
Discusses Political Alliance *[Vilnius Radio]* 43
Leaders Comment on U.S.-USSR Summit *[Paris TV]* 44
Lithuania Issues Communique on Economic Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* 44
Update on Economic Losses *[Vilnius Radio]* 45
Lithuania To Receive Non-Prohibited Goods Via Rail *[Vilnius Radio]* 45
Commentary Views Political Situation in Baltics *[Moscow International]* 45

RSFSR

RSFSR Congress Resumes 7 June *[TASS]* 46
Moscow TV Relays 6 June Proceedings 46
1613 GMT 47
1704 GMT 47
1800 GMT 48
1846 GMT 48
1950 GMT 49
Draft Statement on Right To Secede Cited *[AFP]* 50
Strong Support for Russian Party Displayed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Jun]* 50
Creation of Russian Communist Party Discussed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jun]* 51
Moscow Party Favors Russian Party 'Congress' *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]* 54
Moscow City Party Conference 14-15 June *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Leningrad Youth Newspaper Editor Interviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Jun]* 55

Western Republics

Moldavia Passes Law Against Civil Disobedience *[Moscow TV]* 55
Donetsk Coal Workers To Hold Congress *[TASS]* 56
Ukraine Supreme Soviet 1st Deputy Chairman Elected *[Kiev International]* 56

Caucuaus

Passport Checks, Violence in Nagorno-Karabakh *[Moscow TV]* 56
Weapons Confiscated *[TASS]* 57
Arrival of Military Equipment in Yerevan Reported *[Vilnius Radio]* 57
Correspondent Reports on Armenian Paramilitaries *[Moscow TV]* 57
Armenian Movement Cited on Crisis Solution *[Moscow TV]* 58
Flights Between Armenia, NKAO Curtailed *[Yerevan Radio]* 58
Seizure of Tanks Reported in Armenia *[Yerevan Radio]* 59
Armenian Decision on Republican President *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 4 May]* 59
Armenia Drafts Laws on Presidential Post *[ARMENPRES]* 59
Trains Unload in Armenia After Blockade *[Yerevan International]* 59
Nagorgno-Karabakh Road Construction Noted *[Yerevan International]* 60
Armenian Party Leader Visits Quake Zone *[Yerevan International]* 60
Nakichevan Party Conference Examines Situation *[Moscow TV]* 60

TASS Notes Missile Reduction Initiative

LD0606140390 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—The Soviet Union has taken another step towards ridding Europe of nuclear weapons. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, speaking in Copenhagen at the second human rights meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, announced that by the autumn of next year the Soviet Union will unilaterally eliminate in central Europe 60 launchers of tactical missiles and more than 250 units of nuclear artillery and will withdraw 1,500 nuclear charges. Altogether 140 missile launchers and 3,200 artillery nuclear guns will be reduced by the end of this year.

This Soviet initiative is aimed above all at creating favourable conditions for starting talks with NATO on tactical nuclear armaments in Europe.

The USSR has long been proposing to eliminate these armaments, including the nuclear component for dual-purpose means, as well as nuclear delivery vehicles. At the summit in Washington, the Soviet president made a call to start talks on this problem in the autumn of next year.

It should be noted that there are at present certain positive changes in the stand of the North Atlantic Alliance that has been rejecting proposals for negotiations over a long time.

In May NATO abrogated the programme of modernisation of U.S. nuclear tactical missiles in Europe and expressed the readiness to start talks on the limitation and reduction of these armaments. The United States intends to withdraw part of its nuclear artillery from West German territory.

Favourable conditions are thus shaping for a dialogue on this problem between the two military-political alliances. True, NATO is not yet showing the striving to fully eliminate tactical nuclear armaments in Europe. In Western capitals there is only talk about decreasing nuclear confrontation. But the main thing is to begin such a bilateral process. The advance to the final goal should be made stage-by-stage. At the first period, as the Soviet Union proposed, it would be expedient to discuss substantial cuts in tactical nuclear arsenals in Europe. As the United States and NATO are not fully prepared to eliminate nuclear arms, the Soviet Union suggested last year the idea of joint definition of parameters of the "minimum nuclear deterrence", including tactical nuclear weapons.

Shevardnadze Views Arms Control, U.S. Ties

LD0606154690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 21, 3-10 Jun 90 p 1

[Interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Aleksandr Makhov: "Promising Progress"—date, place not specified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Following talks between the US Secretary of State and the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, Eduard Shevardnadze granted this interview to an MN analyst.

MN: Before Baker's visit to Moscow the Western media were pessimistic about the chances of coordinating the main points of the future strategic offensive weapons treaty in time for the Washington summit. The talks lasting longer than usual added substance to such predictions. Only now are the results of this round of negotiations seen as promising. What lies behind such a drastic change of tone? Has a breakthrough been achieved?

Shevardnadze: In recent months work on the future treaty slowed down considerably because of difficulties regarding sea-based cruise missiles and air-borne cruise missiles. A formula acceptable to both parties has been found only now, during the Moscow round of talks. And it was not easy. There were times when the talks seemed to have reached stalemate, but both parties continued their work, refusing to yield to panic. Once again I would like to give Mr. Baker his due for showing self-control and professionalism.

Long-standing key problems have been resolved. Earlier this week Soviet experts left for Washington to make preparations so that the two presidents should be able to declare that the basis of the future treaty had already been agreed on. We are confident that the treaty will be ready for signing before the end of this year.

MN: Speaking at the press conference in Moscow, Mr. Baker also assessed the talks positively. According to him, considerable progress was achieved in many spheres, with the exception of reductions in conventional weapons. He said Moscow proved unprepared for new American initiatives.

Shevardnadze: The key issues negotiated in Vienna are aviation, the number of troops in Central Europe, tanks, armoured vehicles and arms control. The Soviet delegation tabled a series of proposals. Accordingly, the American party came up with counterproposals. Time will be needed, I believe, to think these matters out. Both we and the Americans need to consult the allies before making final decisions. We agree that the Vienna negotiations ought to be accelerated. At the present round of talks we agreed that objective political developments had outpaced the Vienna talks. I feel there are opportunities to accelerate matters.

MN: What do you think can impede the progress of Soviet-American relations?

Shevardnadze: As representatives of the US administration tell us, the aggravation of the situation in the Baltic republics at the present moment might be an obstacle to further development of Soviet-American relations. I don't see any other objective reasons capable of freezing what I would call the historic processes of further normalization.

Foreign Ministry Spokesman on Arms Control

LD0106122390 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov]

[Text] Washington June 1 TASS—"The world will become better as a result of the current summit. I am very optimistic and I believe that the summit will be a great success. I think that it will be the most fruitful meeting between the leaders of our countries," prominent U.S. industrialist Armand Hammer, chief executive officer of the Occidental Petroleum corporation, told a news conference at the National Press Club on Thursday.

Better mutual understanding between the two countries, new accords and beneficial effect on the situation in the world will be the ultimate result of the summit, said Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov.

He emphasised that the two presidents will sign major agreements on arms control and accords in many fields of bilateral relations.

The establishment of a new Soviet-U.S. joint non-profit venture operation USA-USSR was announced at the news conference. This is actually the first attempt to pool the efforts of representatives of the two countries to give voluntary assistance to third countries in environmental protection, agriculture and medical aid.

The first joint volunteer group of American and Soviet physicians will go this summer to the Mexican settlement of Lerma devastated by the earthquake. It is also planned to send groups of the two countries' specialists to Bangladesh, India, Mozambique, and the Philippines.

This is yet another step in improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the West, said Hammer, who donated 25,000 dollars for the establishment of this joint non-profit venture sponsored by the American private organisation Operation USA and by the Soviet Peace Committee and the USSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of the USA and Canada.

Abandonment of Deterrence Strategy Justified

PM0606144390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel V. Dmitriyev, candidate of technical sciences, and Colonel V. Strebkov, candidate of philosophical sciences: "From the Strategy of Deterrence to Strategic Stability"]

[Text] In the article "Outdated Concept" published on 10 April, we said that in present-day conditions reliable security cannot be guaranteed if one is guided by the concept of nuclear deterrence and a recognition of the permissibility of a nuclear first strike. In our opinion, the search now for ways to prevent war should no longer be conducted in the framework of the strategy of deterrence but through ensuring strategic stability. Herein lies the basis of the transition from deterrence and the balance of force to the balance of the sides' interests. The new political thinking offers that possibility.

Can the present strategic situation in the world be called stable? Only very relatively. The parity situation in the strategic sphere gives the sides not so much equal security as equal danger. Stability will grow only as the level of nuclear confrontation falls progressively lower until nuclear weapons are completely excluded from the military arsenals.

Let us note right away that at the moment this is only a prospect although, as the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit show, it is a realistic one. But the mechanism for a secure world is still being created. A considerable quantity of nuclear weapons still exist and forces which rely on them are still operating. The times demand different approaches. What are they?

The essence of military stability, in our view, is that at each lower level of equilibrium the sides must have a strategic nuclear forces potential which enables them to achieve qualitatively comparable results in the event of an exchange of nuclear strikes. The fulfillment of this condition removes the potential aggressor's hope of gaining any strategic superiority at all. Because the relative qualitative equality of the nuclear forces' combat potential, which is the decisive condition of strategic stability, removes the incentive to try to outdo the opposing side. A nuclear first strike no longer offers any military advantages which, undoubtedly, helps to reduce international tension and promotes the search for other, peaceful ways of resolving conflicts. Of course, the structure of the sides' strategic nuclear forces may vary but the potential at any level—and this is especially important—must be of equal effectiveness of use.

It would seem that the maintenance of equilibrium even at reduced levels does not automatically guarantee strategic stability or solidity. The opportunity to achieve strategic surprise in delivery of a nuclear first strike or the outbreak of nuclear war as a result of an accident, miscalculation, or provocation still remains.

It should be noted that with the increase of technical potential, the obsession with technology has an increasingly strong impact. For example, the apologists of confrontation in space are already stating that the radical change in the technology of war leads to a reduction in the danger of war and that ultimately SDI will stabilize the situation in the world more than it destabilizes it.

This is nothing more than a pipedream. Only the complete elimination of nuclear weapons on a global scale

will remove the nuclear threat. And until that happens it is necessary to neutralize as much as possible the military-strategic preconditions for the occurrence of nuclear conflict. And despite the importance of military technical factors, which may determine this or that decision, it is still the political means of preventing war which are of crucial significance. The new thinking rejects the traditional, essentially technocratic, approach to questions of war and peace because it is now sharply opposed to the very idea of the prevention of war and the survival of mankind.

Quite wide-ranging forms and methods are accumulating in the arsenal of political means of ensuring stability. First, there is the expansion of contacts with representatives of other countries, ranging from heads of states and governments to ordinary citizens. Military contacts play an important role here. Mutual understanding in this sphere is a special factor in increasing the predictability of military activity. As a result the conditions are being created for regulating the levels of nuclear equilibrium through the joint conscious actions of the policymakers. Such contacts bring military political thinking increasingly into line with actual reality and promote movement toward the ultimate zero goal.

Second, strategic stability during the phased lowering of the level of equilibrium down to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons is based on the principle of the deideologization of interstate relations. This gives an opportunity to develop the process of peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems within the kind of framework whose chronology is difficult to define. This is the particular advantage over the completely ideologized concept of deterrence. Crisis situations (for instance, the Caribbean crisis) were due considerably to "crisis thinking" and the extent to which the latter lagged behind the new objective realities of the nuclear era. To prevent such a development of events it is necessary not only to bury the cold war hatchet but also to exclude ideological confrontation from the sphere of interstate relations, including military-political relations.

Third, one of the main conditions for achieving strategic stability at the minimum level of forces is to balance the views of military doctrines and to reduce them to a common defensive denominator. The concretization by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries of their defensive doctrine influences the general thrust of this process. That was shown by the discussion on Warsaw Pact and NATO military doctrines held in Vienna. The discussion centered in particular on individual strategic concepts and the guidelines which are a component of them.

Fourth, the increasing confidence and openness in the military sphere are gaining ever greater political significance for the strengthening of strategic stability. As this process gains content so the framework of the system of measures of confidence and verification will inevitably expand. The maximum possible openness—up to a certain degree of transparency—would be, on the one hand, an incentive to the formation of the new model of security and, on the other, would be a guarantee of the effectiveness of such a model.

The deepening political confidence will necessarily introduce many new and hitherto unknown forms in relations between the sides and ensure the involvement of the people's masses in the solution of vitally important defense problems.

Those, in our view, are some of the views on the matter of ensuring security in conditions of the implementation of the program of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The idea of strategic stability makes it possible to find points of contact between the interests of the USSR and the United States. It "removes" the onesidedness of the doctrine of deterrence and rejects its main postulates: the immutable "enemy image" in the form of the USSR; the striving for the superiority of strategic might; and the possibility of a preemptive use of nuclear weapons. The removal of these elements creates the preconditions for the transition from the principle of superarmament to the principle of defense sufficiency at the lowest possible level of equilibrium. And then to move on to the truly reasonable sufficiency of the sides' military potentials from which nuclear weapons would be totally excluded.

We do not claim, of course, that the opinions that we have expressed are the ultimate truth. The only thing that is absolutely clear is that, on the one hand, security today cannot be based on the doctrines of nuclear deterrence handed down from a completely different era and different military-technical reality, and on the other ensuring security in a mutually vulnerable world brooks no improvisation, as has often been shown in the past. It demands a reliable scientific base, varied approaches, and the prediction of possible trends.

Events Surrounding Warsaw Pact Meeting in Moscow

Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Arrives

LD0606204590 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1930 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier arrived in Moscow from Copenhagen tonight. He joined there the Czechoslovak delegation, led by Vaclav Havel, that will take part in tomorrow's session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact.

Jiri Dienstbier refused to answer the questions of journalists before he acquaints himself with the three-day work of experts and deputy foreign ministers who have prepared the session in Moscow.

Deputy Foreign Minister Zdenek Matejka told the CTK correspondent that they mainly dealt with the preparation of two documents, a declaration and a press statement. He also said that none of the present deputies has yet announced the intention to leave the Warsaw Pact or proposed that it was dissolved.

GDR Prime Minister Arrives

LD0606174590 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1350 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Moscow (ADN)—GDR Prime Minister Lothar de Maiziere arrived in Moscow this afternoon to attend the routine meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states. At the Vnukovo-2 Airport, he was welcomed by USSR Presidential Council Members Aleksandr Yakovlev and Yuriy Osipyan. [passage omitted]

Hungarian Premier Arrives

LD0606180290 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1700 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The Hungarian delegation which is taking part in the meeting—due to begin tomorrow [6 June]—of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, has arrived in Moscow. [passage omitted] At the meeting, Joszef Antall will probably outline the Hungarian proposal on how Budapest would like to transform the Warsaw Pact and the type of new European collective security system it would be possible to create.

The Hungarian premier is expected to extend his stay in Moscow, in order to meet Mikhail Gorbachev, and to meet his Soviet counterpart, Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Jaruzelski on Meeting Expectations

LD0606223190 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 2100 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Before the session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, which opens tomorrow, members of the Polish delegation told journalists about the expectations connected with the Moscow summit. It is another session of the committee, but one which is taking place in a very special situation, and that is why our expectations are greater than usual, President Wojciech Jaruzelski said.

First, we await with great interest Mikhail Gorbachev's information about the results of the summit meeting in Washington. I believe that in the present historical moment we should be particular about the existence of the Warsaw Pact. Its development should proceed toward the increased political character and the military aspects should be kept to the necessary minimum, President Wojciech Jaruzelski said.

Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki also stressed that Mikhail Gorbachev's information about the assessment of the meeting with President Bush will be important from the viewpoint of the European issues which include German unification and its consequences for Poland.

Havel Meets With Goncz, Jaruzelski

LD0606220190 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 2030 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Soviet Union: Vaclav Havel, Czechoslovak president, met in Moscow this evening with Arpad Goncz, acting president of Hungary. Before that our highest representative spoke for more than an hour with Wojciech Jaruzelski. According to Lubos Dobrovskiy, representative of the Foreign Ministry of the CSFR, among other things they were in agreement on their views about the future existence and purpose of the Warsaw Treaty. This question will be the key point on the agenda of tomorrow's session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty. During preparatory talks all the delegations agreed that a changed Warsaw Treaty orientated toward the creation of new European-wide security structures could play a temporary positive role in Europe.

TASS Notes Agenda of Meeting

LD0606151890 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—A regular conference of the Political Consultative Committee, the supreme body of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, will open here on Thursday. Heads of state and government, foreign ministers and defence ministers of Warsaw Treaty countries will participate.

It was learnt from sources in the Soviet Foreign Ministry that the conference will hear a report by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on the results of the Soviet-American summit in Washington.

Participants will discuss European development, disarmament and strengthening European security and further cooperation among member-countries.

Talk will probably focus on the German unification and ways to integrate the opposing blocs into the European security system.

At the previous meeting in Bucharest in July last year, participants adopted a statement for a stable and secure Europe, free of nuclear and chemical weapons, for substantial cuts in armed forces, armaments and military expenditures.

The participants in the conference called for overcoming confrontation between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, establishing a constructive dialogue between the two blocs along political and military lines, and ensuring that this dialogue becomes a factor of European security and cooperation.

Participants in the Bucharest conference confirmed the principled stand of Warsaw Treaty countries. Their call to rid Europe of military blocs and simultaneously disband both alliances and, as an initial step, eliminate their military organisations remains valid.

The new meeting of the Warsaw Treaty countries Political Consulative Committee will develop and deepen the Helsinki process and stability in Europe.

Commentator Previews Pact Meeting

LD0606185390 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Commentary by Aleksandr Pogodin]

[Excerpts] The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries is meeting in Moscow on 7 June. Aleksandr Pogodin believes that the conference of this highest collective body of the Warsaw Treaty Orgnization will be fundamentally different from all of the previous ones. [passage omitted]

These developments are very important, but apparently they are only the beginning of more deep, fundamental changes in the Warsaw Treaty. This is true of the structure and nature of relations between the member countries and the general concept of the union too. It is highly likely that all these problems will be discussed by the Political Consultative Committee. Many of its members took office in their countries just recently.

The Political Consultative Committee is expected to hear President Gorbachev's account of his talks with President Bush which paid particular attention to that set of problems. As for the Soviet Union's attitude to these questions it relies on the idea of a common European home.

The point at issue is not only ending the military confrontation of blocs. The coexistence of blocs will also be phased out. The promising process of European and world integration will be gradually creating a common economic space. Politically Europe has already entered into a new stage of the Helsinki process. Permanent security structures replacing NATO and the Warsaw Treaty will be its distinguishing feature. It won't be easy to achieve these aims and the Warsaw Treaty countries could already now help ease military confrontation in the continent and ensure stability in the first place on a political basis.

It's impossible to predict the specific results of the Political Consultative Committee's meeting, but it would be quite reasonable to expect that it will boost the favorable processes in Europe, writes in conclusion, Radio Moscow's Aleksandr Pogodin.

Warsaw Pact Meeting Opens

LD0706072290 Moscow TASS in English 0706 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents]

[Text] Moscow June 7 TASS—A regular session of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC), the highest Warsaw Treaty Organisation collective body, opened here today.

It is attended by Warsaw Treaty heads of state and government, foreign and defence ministers, WTO [Warsaw Treaty Organization] United Armed Forces Commander-in-Chief Petr Lushev, Chief of Staff Vladimir Lobov and PCC Secretary-General Ivan Aboimov.

Participants in the session will discuss the construction of a common Europe, disarmament and strengthening security on the continent and Warsaw Treaty member-states' cooperation.

They will also discuss German unification and ways to integrate the two military blocks into an all-European security system.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will inform participants on the results of the Soviet-U.S. Washington summit.

Pact Defense Ministers To Meet Mid-June

LD0506174790 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—The Warsaw Treaty defence ministers' committee will hold its regular meeting in the East German capital, Berlin, in mid-June, it was officially announced here today.

Bloc Military Historians Hold Conference

PM0606091090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Unnamed "our correspondent" report: "Historians' Conference"]

[Text] A conference of leaders of military history institutions of the socialist states' armies has begun work at

the USSR Defense Ministry Institute of Military History. Taking part are representatives of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, the DPRK, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia.

The conference was opened by Colonel General D. Volkogonov, chief of the institute. Recent events in our countries, he noted, should be no obstacle to relations among military scholars. Indeed, they raise cooperation among the fraternal countries' military historians to a new level. This cooperation could be enriched by: the holding of symposiums and the publication of collections of speeches or articles; the reciprocal exchange of lecturers on military history; mutual assistance in the study of archives; the exchange of articles in military history journals; and other forms of cooperation.

Col. Gen. Volkogonov proposed that cooperation programs be drawn up for the long term.

The topic "The Role of Military Historical Science in the Social Renewal of Society" was presented for discussion by the conference participants.

Those present were addressed by Academician A. Samsonov, chairman of the international editorial collegium for the work "Causes of World War II: Documents and Materials" ["Prichiny Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny. Dokumenty i Materialy"].

TASS Reports CSCE Meeting Proceedings

LD0606150990 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Kiselev and Taras Lariokhin]

[Text] Copenhagen June 6 TASS—Fluttering above the "Bella-centret", Denmark's largest exhibition hall, are flags of the 35 participant countries in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). The second sitting of the CSCE conference on human dimension is in its second day there. It concentrated from the very outset on the new Soviet disarmament proposal.

Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze announced the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally reduce the number of tactical missile launching pads in Central Europe by 60 units, nuclear artillery pieces—by more than 250 units, and to remove 1,500 nuclear warheads from the continent. By the end of the year the total number of launching pads and atomic artillery pieces will be reduced by 140 and 3,200 units correspondingly.

This initiative was hailed by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher noted that these Soviet proposals signified fresh progress in arms control in Europe. French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas said the Soviet decision was among the first results of the Soviet-American summit.

The success of the Washington talks, local analysts point out, has created a favourable atmosphere for holding the Copenhagen forum. The meeting between Baker and Shevardnadze was an important event on the forum's first day. It bridged, so to say, the Washington summit with the current talks. The Soviet and U.S. ministers discussed important questions of building a new Europe and, as stressed by Baker, achieved concrete progress.

A special meeting of CSCE foreign ministers was held during the forum. An agreement was reached to set up a committee of representatives from the above-mentioned 35 countries to lay the groundwork for a European summit. It is planned to hold it in Paris at the end of the year. Representatives of many countries are calling for the early institutionalisation of the all-European process and a permanent CSCE secretariat.

The forum is now being addressed by foreign ministers of CSCE countries. They are outlining their views on pressing humanitarian problems. Bilateral contacts are being established actively to promote relations in a new Europe, no longer divided by the Berlin Wall. There is a general atmosphere of optimism, engendered by the Copenhagen meeting.

This forum, the Danish INFORMATION newspaper says, has clearly shown that there has never before been such unanimity on legal matters and on basic human liberties in the history of the European continent. The newspaper expresses the hope that for the first time in European history the meeting will issue a final document, laying down directions for implementing fundamental political principles that bind all European states.

Gerasimov States NATO Is 'Obsolete'

PM0606155690 London BBC Television Network in English 2130 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Interview with Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov by Peter Snow in Washington on BBC 2 "Newsnight" program; no date given—recorded]

[Text] [Snow] But first, Soviet spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov: Did he think the summit had achieved anything on Germany?

[Gerasimov] Germany was not on the agenda in terms of agreement or no agreement: It was not on the agenda. There was an exchange of views on Germany, and it is going to be continued on the level of our foreign ministers. And there was better understanding of our positions, so even here you can register a certain success, but it was never expected to solve the issue here.

[Snow interrupts] Indeed, but there was a powerful expectation, was there not, built up by Mr. Gorbachev himself...

[Gerasimov interrupts] No, no...

[Snow] ...built up by Mr. Gorbachev himself, that he wanted Mr. Bush to give him something, at least something on Germany. What's he got?

[Gerasimov] He got the American position explained in detail and, as I understand from his press conference, they're a little bit closer, they're moving. You see, our position is that unified Germany must be integrated into all-European system of security and stability—and it brings up the question of the nature of NATO. In my view, these four letters—N-A-T-O—may stand for "Navies-Aircraft-Tanks-Obsolete," because President Bush himself was talking when he met Gorbachev at the conference, at the press conference, he was talking, going beyond containment. NATO was created to contain the Soviet Union. If he wants to go beyond containment and to retain logic, he must go beyond NATO—NATO must change its character.

[Snow] What guarantees do you want? What do you want the Germans to say now that they will or will not do that'll satisfy you?

[Gerasimov] We invite fresh ideas here. And the guarantee in my view is this... some kind of this all-European security, or we mentioned this greater European council. This is one of the possible ideas which can be explored.

[Snow] What good would that be? To have a United Nations in Europe, a League of Nations or something—what real, what real peace force would that be...

[Gerasimov interrupts] We are in search of fresh ideas. Don't press me: I'm not an idea generator.

[Snow] Understood. Everybody wants to find a solution, but if a solution isn't found that suits you, is Mr. Gorbachev really, genuinely meaning that he may unravel the whole talk of troop cuts and arms cuts in Europe, if he isn't satisfied?

[Gerasimov] It's all "if." As I see the situation, everybody wants to find the solution.

[Snow] But it's a threat, isn't it? If you don't give me what I want on Germany, I will unravel...

[Gerasimov interrupts] No, there is no threat.

[Snow] ...the present troop...

[Gerasimov] No, there is no threat. No.

[Snow] Well, what does he say? What was he meaning then?

[Gerasimov] No, no. No, it's no threat.

[Snow] What does he mean, when he's going to review the process of arms control negotiation...

[Gerasimov] Because we must somehow take care of our security interest. And he has psychological pressure, in a sense that somewhere back in our minds we still have these awful memories of the war: We had 27 million dead as a price of our victory, and it is a psychological factor which must be taken into account by any Soviet politician.

[Snow] So there may be a situation in which you would have to keep your troop strengths higher than you would otherwise have done?

[Gerasimov] No. No, no. It will be just confrontational approach, which as I understand, both sides agree that it belongs to the past.

[Snow] You still haven't quite said what you will do if you don't get what you want.

[Gerasimov] Well, I must keep you guessing—it's just politics—keep you guessing.

UN Contributions to Peace, Security Examined

LD0406181990 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—By TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Yuriy Rublevsky:

At a briefing here, Andrey Kozyrev, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Directorate for International Organizations, praised the United Nation's contribution to the maintenance of peace and international security.

On May 30 the U.N. Security Council endorsed a statement on U.N. peace-keeping operations, Kozyrev said. The statement pointed out that the U.N. had been playing an increasingly important role in operations to maintain peace and security and to settle international disputes.

A vivid example of this kind of U.N. activity was provided by the peace operation in Namibia, which recently joined the community of U.N. member nations. The operation directly involved 109 U.N. member-states.

By endorsing the statement, the U.N. Security Council paid tribute to the United Nations and countries that work for the maintenance of peace and international security. The council members expressed their determination to cooperate with the U.N. secretary-general in such operations if necessary, Kozyrev said.

At the same time he described as "a fly in the ointment" the U.S. veto on a Security Council draft resolution concerning Israel. The draft resolution suggested instituting a three-member commission to inquire into Israel's policy and practice on the occupied Arab territories.

The U.S. veto could be fraught with consequences, as tension in the area continues to escalate, Kozyrev said.

Touching upon the work of the U.N. Commission for Disarmament, he pointed out that "for the first time in its 11 years of activity the commission adopted a whole package of decisions reflecting positive changes and new aspects in the international atmosphere, particularly after the Soviet-American summit."

The decisions comprise outlooks that are new to disarmament-related U.N. documents, specifically those connected with environmental protection, Kozyrev noted.

The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman informed journalists of the current seminar in Moscow on the future of the United Nations. Political scientists from the Soviet Union, the United States and other countries participating in the seminar are analysing humanitarian and other aspects of U.N. activities, military conversion, and the integration of the Soviet economy into the world economy.

Yakovlev Addresses Investment Conference in Moscow

LD3005202990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The international conference on finance, investment, and trade with the Soviet Union has opened at the International Trade Center, Moscow.

[Correspondent Ye. Blokhin, identified by screen caption] Over 100 representatives from major Western and Eastern companies are taking part in the conference. It was organized by the FINANCIAL TIMES, the Royal Institute of International Affairs in Great Britain, and our Institute of World Economics and International

Relations. Businessmen would like to get first-hand information on the situation in our country, participants in the meeting said. A frank evaluation of the state of affairs was given at the conference. Now a crucial and fundamental period has come, and this period is transition to the market, Comrade Yakovlev stressed in his report.

[Begin Yakovlev recording] (?Another) determining goal of economic reform and transition to the market can be seen in attaining a breakthrough at the level of economic freedom. Without economic freedom, political democracy will not have reliable foundations and a realistic base either. [end recording]

[Blokhin] Leading economists of our country answered questions from participants in the international conference. [Video shows businessmen in the lobby, Yakovlev and Abalkin speaking from the rostrum]

Petrovskiy Receives Helsinki Rights Officials

LD0106102490 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy received leaders of the international Helsinki human rights federation here today.

He said that the USSR attaches great importance to a dialogue with the public on issues of human rights and humanitarian subjects.

The Copenhagen meeting on human dimensions of the all-European process, beginning on June 5, will open great opportunities for that since it will be accompanied by events to be staged by many human rights organisations.

Participants in the meeting will continue the work started at the Paris conference last year and create conditions for a successful holding of the Moscow meeting in 1991.

The federation leaders expressed satisfaction with democratic changes that are taking place in the USSR.

Both sides expressed similar views on the importance and usefulness of the exchange of experience in handling complicated humanitarian problems, such as interethnic clashes, and in shaping confidence-building measures in the humanitarian field.

Petrovskiy Receives Australian, Indian Envoys

PM0106095690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] On 23 May USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy received C.R. Ashwin, Australian ambassador to the USSR.

The ambassador was given USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze's reply to Australian Foreign Minister G. Evans' letter on the question of strengthening the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) system of guarantees in the context of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

On the same day V.F. Petrovskiy received A.S. Gonsalves, Indian ambassador to the USSR. Questions relating to the creation of peace zones and nuclear-free zones were discussed.

V.F. Petrovskiy met with K.-A. Fleischauer, UN deputy secretary general for legal questions. He also had a talk with O. Otunu [as transliterated], president of the International Peace Academy, in the course of which questions of cooperation with that organization were examined.

World Peace Council Officials Interviewed

WA0606185890 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 90 p 5

[Article by Ye. Kalyadina: "All the Peace for Hard-Currency Rubles"]

[Text] Vladimir Orel, the Soviet representative at the World Peace Council, came to the point right away, as they say.

"What have you come here for? For 'a smear job?' Or do you want to sort out the real state of affairs?"

I was taken aback somewhat. Vladimir Nikolayevich went on to explain:

"If you are here for 'a smear job,' just say so, don't be embarrassed. I am not going to conceal anything. I can tell you an entire satirical novel. However, the point is that it is no longer current. All of it happened, happened indeed... However, a new life has now begun for us."

Vladimir Orel began to tell me about "serious steps forward toward radical transformations" taken in February of this year in Athens at a regular WPC [World Peace Council] session. He told me in detail about:
"—created opportunities of a conceptual and structural nature which were reflected in the new WPC statutory document;"
"—codified departure from the old interpretation of the WPC as some superstructure built on the party model;"
"—decentralization of the practical work of the WPC on a regional principle..."

In general, a picture of the happy future of the fighters for peace on our planet painted in the genre quoted above was revealed to me. All that remained was to be happy for both the fighters and our planet, and to leave Helsinki with this feeling. However, my business trip was not to have "a happy ending."

However, everything should be arranged chronologically. First, I will describe how I ended up in Helsinki.

It all began with an interview which former WPC Secretary, the American Rob Prince, gave to one of my colleagues. This was a sad interview. Here are some, and not the most bitter, confessions of the author: "No real renewal of the WPC has begun. It may continue to exist for several more years. The question is what for?"

Later, Rob Prince invited me to Helsinki to see everything with my own eyes.

At first I saw Rob. Wearing an old-fashioned hat and a backpack on his shoulder, he looked like a fatigued Don Quixote rather than a world-class official. He, a teacher by profession and head of the American Peace Committee, had served in Helsinki for almost five years. He came with a sincere belief in our perestroyka and in the changes it will entail in the work of the WPC. His hopes turned to disappointment, and Rob decided to pack his bags.

I also found some other employees of the WPC headquarters "with their bags packed." Some had already managed to depart. Actually, the deserted premises of the council, though outfitted with state-of-the-art equipment, looked like an abandoned schooner rather than a ship of hope.

Why did these people who in my view are sincerely devoted to their cause, not share the brilliant hopes of the Soviet representative? Why didn't they believe in the bright future of the WPC?

We need to look into the past in order to answer this question.

It is hardly worthwhile to take issue with the fact that the WPC created 40 years ago on the crest of the anti-Fascist movement was not a "stillborn child." The echo of the past war still reverberated, and the threat of a new, much more terrifying, war was real. The World Council did a lot in order to avert this threat and teach people holding different views to understand each other. There was nothing reprehensible about the first voice in the council at the time being Soviet. The world looked to us as saviors, they believed us, and had trust in us.

However we betrayed this trust soon.

Rob Prince: "Gradually, the antiwar movement, which enjoyed support in Europe and in the world, came to be influenced by Soviet foreign policy and the WPC virtually turned into its instrument. It existed for the sole purpose of making the people believe in the infallibility of Soviet 'peace initiatives,' such as, say, the movement of Soviet troops into Czechoslovakia.

"A crisis occurred in the late 1970's when the deployment of Soviet and American nuclear missiles began in Europe. In the West a new, broad-based movement appeared—conventions on European nuclear disarmament. It stated that the USSR and the United States are 'equally responsible' for an increase in military threat and sought to turn Europe into a nuclear-free zone. In response, the WPC began to build barricades. The SKZM [Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace] led. Without embarrassment, it came down on the West European 'antimissile activists' for, as we can read in one of the extensively circulated SKZM brochures, 'trying to create an anti-Soviet peace movement on the assignment of militant imperialist reactionaries.'"

Mark Waller, worker at the WPC Information Center: "We found ourselves in an idiotic situation. In our statements, we had to refer to the Soviet SS-20's as 'the missiles of peace.' We indeed called them so. However, it was not simple to explain to rank-and-file participants in the movement why the Soviet missiles bring peace and the American missiles bring the horrors of war. They stopped believing us."

This was the beginning of the end. The more profound the crisis within the WPC got the more grandiose the events held by its leadership became. New appeals for strengthening peace sounded ever more loudly and unanimously at splendid congresses. Resolutions of the congress were given the unanimous support of participants, despite the rank-and-file fighters having no vote at the congresses.

Rob Prince: "All of this looked like a tragicomedy, and a quite expensive one at that, because these pleasures—luxury hotels, magnificent food, and pastimes—were free to the participants."

The efforts to convince the supporters of peace that the policy of the WPC was infallible were in vain. In its turn, the WPC leadership ensured the USSR leadership with devotion that the peace movement unquestioningly supported Soviet foreign policy. The war in Afghanistan was in progress, but the highest WPC awards, the (Jolio Curie) gold medals, were pinned on the breasts of Soviet leaders.

I happened to hear a bitter confession from former WPC General Secretary Johannes Pakaslahti: "We now feel

guilty not only before the rank-and-file supporters of peace in our countries but also before the Soviet people, whom we falsely convinced that world public opinion was on the side of the USSR."

What is the explanation for the unanimous patience which WPC members displayed in response to Soviet pressure?

It is the fact that the WPC is 90 percent financed by the Soviet Union. (To be sure, at the session in Athens the decision was made for the WPC to switch to self-financing, but for now it is only a decision, and not the first one at that). This fact is no longer a secret in and of itself. Another thing is unknown. Why is the WPC budget carefully concealed from its workers?

Rob Prince: "All my attempts to gain access to the financial reports of the council turned out to be futile. They explained this to me by stating that the reports were compiled in keeping with an old pattern which is in effect in the USSR only, and I would hardly be able to understand anything in them."

To be sure, they do not hide from the staff of the council that the WPC is facing a serious financial crisis caused by difficulties in the Soviet economy as well as changes in the countries of East Europe, as a result of which the WPC budget lost $150,000 sent annually from the GDR, $120,000 from Budapest and Prague, as well as $80,000 from Warsaw. However, how can these financial dislocations be reconciled with the fact that the former leader of the WPC, Romesh Chandra, who was elected in Athens its honorary president for life, continues to draw previous financial benefits—that is his salary, residences, free transportation, and so on.

Vladimir Orel explained this generosity to me by a moral aspect of sorts. Supposedly, we kept for many years a man who served us faithfully at the helm of this organization, so do we leave him out in the cold now? This definitely makes sense. However, are we not too magnanimous with our ethics at present when we try to justify our old unethical policy in this manner? Will they understand us? At the very least, those to whom I talked in Helsinki do not understand.

I do not at all approach the issue from a purely financial standpoint: He who pays orders the music. After all, along with poor relations there are also quite affluent organizations among the WPC members whose budgets are replenished by the state as, for example, in Finland. This is why I am not inclined to think that the interest of antiwar organizations in the WPC will decline due to its coffers getting leaner. Why will it decline?

Here are some opinions:

Key Sevon [name as published], general secretary of the Finnish Peace Committee: "The main problem is that the WPC has turned into a purely bureaucratic organization which has lost any live contact whatsoever with the national movements. In Athens we ultimately lost our hope for its renaissance because all discussions involved solely issues of protocol. Not a word was said about what the essence of the renewed movement should be."

Mark Waller: "The WPC is a paper organization. Literally tons of paper are sent from Helsinki to various countries—resolutions, declarations, appeals to close ranks in the struggle against imperialism. What about specific deeds? How have we really helped the people in Nicaragua, South Africa, Palestine? Alas, only by our speeches, appeals, and stormy applause..."

Johannes Pakaslahti: "I have happened to communicate with the representatives of many antiwar organizations in Europe, and I understood that they will never join the WPC. The dependence of the WPC on the USSR, which is even greater than before, is the reason."

Listening to my interlocutors, I took the liberty of pondering a heretical question. Why is it that at present, after the policy of perestroyka has greatly boosted the prestige of our country, "the Soviet influence," on the contrary, undermines the authority of the WPC?

It turned out that perestroyka and the Soviet influence as such are not the issue. Specific influence, that of the SKZM, is the issue. As my interlocutors admitted, there has been no perestroyka at all within it. This is, for example, what I happened to hear from Rob Prince:

"Old thinking still prevails in the SKZM. They continue to see us as mere instruments for implementing their policy. The SKZM leadership consists of the same people who were at the helm of the struggle for peace 20 years ago. They speak beautifully, but they do not know how to listen. They are still racking their brains over grandiose and worthless projects instead of doing specific things. Besides, one gets the impression that the SKZM is something of a travel agency for its staff, and for very comfortable travel at that. I remember the Peace March across the United States. At the time we invited SKZM representatives. They came eagerly. However, they immediately decided that walking in the heat is not too merry a prospect. This is why they rented an air-conditioned bus with the funds available to them and 'marched' in it..."

Here are two more opinions:

Key Sevon: "The SKZM has turned into a propaganda machine for the support of official Soviet policy. It is not capable of developing its own point of view. Besides, one gets the impression that only 'the peace officials' participate in the Soviet movement. At any rate, at various meetings we have frequently more to do with professional soldiers of the ideological front than common citizens."

Johannes Paskalahti: "I do not think that the SKZM is much use for the Soviet people. At any rate it is no longer prestigious among the supporters of peace in other countries."

It could be that these admissions are emotional, that the absence of specific facts makes them unconvincing. However, I am not at all quoting these bitter words, though spoken without malice, as proof. As I see it, they should prompt the SKZM functionaries to think rather than refute. There is definitely something to think about if their comrades-in-arms have such an opinion of them...

However, when I came to the SKZM, to its Secretary Grigoriy Lokshin to share my sad impressions of the trip to Helsinki, I understood that they do indeed ponder the situation here.

At the entrance to the SKZM building there was a large picture display headed "A New Stage in the Struggle for Peace." I queried Grigoriy Mikhaylovich: What does this mean? In his answer, he revealed a mysterious "four D's" formula: decentralization, democratization, deideologization, and finally, debureaucratization. He said that at present the committee is called upon not to struggle against an abstract looming threat of war but to build peace, primarily the prosperous life of its people. I cannot but agree with this. Likewise I cannot but rejoice at the plans drawn, for example, setting up the national reconciliation fund or the program of rescuing small and disappearing peoples.

To be sure these were plans, even if hopeful. In reality some things were painful. When I asked the person in charge of the so-called "public reception office" (which, as far as I understand, was set up in order to enlist citizens more vigorously for the work of the committee) about those coming to it, I was surprised to learn that among them are those are wishing to improve their housing situation, purchase a foreign tour or just airline tickets, and so on.

Irina Sergeyevna lamented: "Unfortunately, people do not know the peculiarities of our work well."

If so, who does the SKZM exist for?

Employees of the committee proudly told me about how they successfully enlist the informals for their work. A day later I learned from one of them, member of the board of the "Civil Peace" Association Yuriy Krasnorutskiy, that the SKZM had ignored their proposals, barred their access to meetings with foreign delegations, and took them along on foreign trips only on the condition that they would run all their speeches by the leadership of the committee. The informals were present at the recent "Open Door Week" in Spain but... on the initiative of the hosts themselves.

Several more questions which I asked at the SKZM were left without an answer.

In keeping with the SKZM Charter, the organization adheres to a program adopted at the conference. By all signs such a program is found in the message of greetings from the Central Committee and K.U. Chernenko personally adopted by the last conference in January 1985.

How current is this document at "the new stage of the struggle for peace?" In which year of perestroyka will a new SKZM conference be held?

While wandering through the office mazes of the Soviet "citadel of peace" I unwittingly recalled a modest floor which the Peace Committee of Finland occupies and in which 14 full-time people work, including clerical employees. Is the work of our committee indeed so significant that 10 times as many officials handle it? Does the esteemed SKZM chairman really need 32 deputies (mainly representatives of the literary trade) if no more than 10 of them usually attend meetings of the bureau?

While denouncing the period of "stagnation" in the SKZM, Grigoriy Mikhaylovich Lokshin defined its mission at the time as "the strict propaganda of the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state." What about now? Does the committee have its publicly announced position, and not that of the state, on the issue of the complete discontinuation of nuclear tests in the USSR? What do they think here about the issue of arms sales in the Third World? Or about an alternative civilian service? I will admit openly: I did not understand this. I would like not to believe it, but perhaps they are still convinced at the SKZM that "the very socialist essence of our system by its very nature predetermines the absence of differences on the issues of war and peace between the position of the broad masses of the working people and the official state position." (G.M. Lokshin, Problems of Ideological Struggle in the Contemporary Antiwar Movement, A Study for Use by Soviet Public Organizations, Moscow, 1986).

Having come out of the quiet WPC headquarters, I asked the first passers-by I met whether they knew what kind of organization occupies this building. The people shrugged their shoulders. As for me, I thought: Could it be that all of these "peace" passions are in vain? Perhaps it is time for the "peace guards" to sound off? After all, who is afraid of a war in earnest now?

My Helsinki friends categorically disagreed with me. They took a broader view of security. Ecology, social development, AIDS, drug addiction—such are the prospects they have outlined for their movements. Finally, not all the guns on the planet have fallen silent, and not all the swords have been beaten into plowshares...

Rob Prince is convinced that objectively the world needs an organization such as the WPC. The only issue is that it should not resemble the current one. When I asked Rob what is necessary in order to change the WPC he answered: First, the SKZM will have to change. I did not feel an attitude of dependence in these words. As I see it, there was confidence in them that has not been lost yet.

From my conversation with Grigoriy Lokshin, I remember a fortunate comparison: "At present, we at the SKZM are sort of chasing a train which is already

leaving. There is still an opportunity for us to jump into the last two or three cars. However, if we procrastinate a little, the train will leave."

I wish we could make it before a train takes away from Helsinki the last enthusiasts of the cause of peace.

International Oil Conference Held in Moscow

LD0106132890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] A meeting of representatives of the Independent Oil Exporting Countries, IPEC, opened in Moscow today. Delegations from Angola, Egypt, China, Malaysia, Mexico, USSR, the States of Alaska and Texas, the United States, and the province of Alberta (Canada) are taking part. A Norwegian representative is attending as an observer. The agenda includes the present situation on the world oil market and measures to stabilize oil prices.

International Lenin Peace Prize Committee Set Up

LD2705104490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 26 May 90

[Text] In accordance with the decision of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 11 December 1989 on the International Lenin Peace Prize, a Committee for International Lenin Peace Prizes has been set up. It consists of 11 people. They are prominent politicians and public figures from the Soviet Union and other countries. Academician Boris Yevgenyevich Paton, USSR people's deputy and president of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, heads of the committee.

United States & Canada

Reportage, Commentary Continue on Gorbachev Visit

Comparison of Meeting With Businessmen

PM0606093990

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 6 June 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page 6 a TASS report on Gorbachev's meeting with businessmen in Minneapolis. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "USSR-United States: For an Effective Mechanism of Business Ties," with the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in the 5 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 28-30, reveals the following variations:

Page 28, column one, paragraph one, sentence one reads: As already announced, the USSR president met representatives of business circles and the agro-industrial complex of the Midwest on Sunday. (adding words)

Page 28, column two, paragraph two, only sentence reads: An agreement was signed on 2 June 1990 on establishing a joint enterprise to survey and work the "Tengiz" oil deposit. (rewording)

Comparison of 1 Jun Dinner Speech

PM0406130790

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 3 June 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page 5 a TASS report on a speech given by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev at a dinner in honor of U.S. President G. Bush in the USSR Embassy in Washington 1 June. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, under the general heading "Toward a New, Peaceful Civilization," with the translation of the Moscow Domestic Russian version published in the 4 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 33-34, reveals the following variations:

Page 33, column two, paragraph two, sentence four reads: In this year alone, President Bush and I are to meet again on at least two occassions—at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, where a treaty on the reduction of conventional weapons in Europe will, I hope, be signed, and, once more, in order to sign a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons. (adding words)

Page 34, column one, second full paragraph, sentence two reads: As we understand it, two processed must be accomplished—the final settlement of the results of the war and the solution of internal questions on the transformation of the two parts of Germany into a single state. This does form the content of the transitional period, the end of which will mean that the rights of the four victorious powers—which arose, incidentally, not through the division of Germany, but directly according to the results of the war—will lapse and that a new, soveriegn state will appear. (deleting words)

Commentary Praises Visit

LD0606121390 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Analyst Mikhail Mayorov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] The latest Soviet-American summit has been the most productive of them all, with upwards of a dozen agreements signed in the course of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit. Still, the most significant result, points out our analyst Mikhail Mayorov, goes beyond any official document.

Following their meeting in Malta last December, Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush resolutely left behind in their dialogue the period of cold war. You may think this is a philosophical treatment of the results of their talks, but it has quite a concrete and real sense. The cold war determined the most dramatic tensions in the world for decades: the confrontation and the arms race. It hampered contacts between political leaders and ordinary people, and echoed in the Third World in flaring regional conflicts which were also part of the cold war. At last the Berlin Wall has come down, bringing new realities to Europe.

Though politics are not sports, there is some talk of winners and losers in the cold war. The attitude has also been projected on the current Soviet-American dialogue, but neither in Washington nor in Camp David any of the sides attempted to foist its will upon the other. The cold war, as a nuclear war, can have no winners. Decades of confrontation have tried the resources and the nerves both in Moscow and Washington quite enough. We can't talk of a convergence of the two systems, but their goals have changed. From a confrontation they have changed to interaction to achieve a world without wars and with equality and freedom.

Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush have obviously closed the chapter of history opened 45 years ago in Fulton by Churchill. The British prime minster made a speech in that American town which marked the beginning of the cold war. The Fulton period has sunk into the past, and what period is now beginning? Shall we call it Malta, Washington, or Camp David period? Queries our analyst Mikhail Mayorov. Whatever name we give it, we happen to be the last generation to witness those unhappy times that went down in history as the cold war.

IZVESTIYA Cites Baker, U.S. Press

PM0606211990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by own correspondents A. Blinov and A. Shalnev: "Drawing a Line Under the Cold War"]

[Text] Washington—President G. Bush opened a session of his cabinet on Monday with words of gratitude to the staffers and experts of the administration's departments for making the Soviet-American summit happen. "I am

satisfied with the results of the meeting. They are very positive," the President told the secretaries and personal advisers present at the session.

The day before, the U.S. President's closest advisers: Secretary of State J. Baker, J. Sununu, chief of staff to the President, and B. Scowcroft, assistant to the President for national security affairs, had appeared on the main national television channels and assessed the results of the meeting.

Secretary of State J. Baker, appearing on NBC, singled out the accords on halting the production of chemical weapons and on key questions of the treaty on the reduction of both countries' strategic offensive nuclear arsenals as very important concrete achievements of the meeting.

The leader of the U.S. diplomatic department described as "serious and substantive" the discussion in Washington of the question of the situation in Europe in connection with the upcoming unification of Germany, although it revealed the two sides' different approaches.

Baker announced that the discussion would be further developed. He intends to meet with USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze in Copenhagen and then he will expound the results of the Washington dialogue for the benefit of the ministers of the NATO allies.

According to Baker, the U.S. stance is based on the "nine points" put forward at the Washington meeting. They envisage preserving NATO in a "more political" role than before, and, at the same time, providing the Helsinki process with institutions containing a "security component." The United States is in favor of a united Germany's being a full-fledged member of NATO and, at the same time, it favors "corresponding security guarantees for Germany's eastern neighbors." In particular, the possibility of concluding a treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact will be studied.

The secretary of state noted that the Soviet-American trade agreement signed during the summit is in U.S. interests. Therefore the U.S. side has decided to record the accords that were reached in the form of a document, although President Bush will not send the agreement to Congress for ratification until the USSR adopts a new law regulating entry and exit questions. (This condition is stipulated by the Jackson-Vanik legislative amendment that is effective in the United States). Moreover, according to him, the situation in Lithuania is also a barrier to ratification.

The U.S. media stress not only the importance of the accords that were reached and the agreements that were signed, but, above all, the qualitatively new aspects of the Soviet-American dialogue which emerged during the meeting.

THE WASHINGTON POST notes in an editorial that the "easing of the sense of danger and confrontation, which predominated in the past, enabled both sides to present a wider and and more profound range of questions for discussion."

Like THE WASHINGTON POST, another leading U.S. paper, THE NEW YORK TIMES, notes the "uncommon mutual understanding and respect" that were established between the Soviet and U.S. presidents. The article says that the Soviet leader's first visit to the United States in 1987 "stunned Washington." "This summit meeting lacked the thrill of discovery, but its results are more substantial." "George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev, with their pens, drew a line under the cold war," the paper says.

Petrovskiy on Shevardnadze-Baker Meeting

LD0606214290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 6 June, in its "Vremya" newscast, broadcasts a two-minute report by correspondent E. Sorokin from Copenhagen on the conference on the human dimension being held there. Thirty three European countries and also the United States and Canada are taking part in it. V. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, is interviewed by Sorokin. He says that good opportunities exist to fill the concept of a united European legal space with a real content which, when having come into being, will create common criteria for resolving questions connected with contacts between people.

Petrovskiy goes on: "Of course, the meeting between Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and James Baker at the residence of the Soviet ambassador in Denmark, which took place late last night, attracted great attention among the correspondents. It lasted about two hours. The Soviet foreign minister and the American secretary of state, replying to numerous questions, noted that after the Washington meeting, new factors and ideas had emerged. Now one really has to get down to drafting work." The video shows Shevardnadze and Baker shaking hands outside the Soviet Embassy; and Shevardnadze speaking inside.

Scant Foreign Steps To Aid Economy Hit

PM0406123390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Lev Strzhizhovskiy "View From Moscow": "If I Were A Banker..."]

[Text] It is a strange situation. The more events there are in the countries of East Europe and the Soviet Union to attract Western attention, the more you hear conflicting views and advice. You get the impression that you are at a stock market where everyone is shouting out their own figures, doing their own job, although they are in fact all part of the stock exchange. Today Western politicians everywhere verbally acknowledge their commitment to the "new thinking" and are doing extremely little in

terms of actions to back this up. I am referring to the Soviet economy, which is, without doubt, the foundation of perestroyka. How will the West feel if the words of Harvard economist Dzh. Shelton [initial as transliterated] come true: "It would be a pity if the policy of glasnost were to perish along with the economy."

Last fall fate (in the shape of my new friends in the Federal Reserve System [federalisty]) brought me to the holy of holies in world finance in Washington—the Federal Reserve System. My interlocutor, a well-known influential person, put his hand on my dictaphone and asked me not to write down the conversation or mention any names. I was interested in aid for the Soviet economy. Particularly the possibility of ruble convertibility, which is necessary and at the same time still a remote possibility. True to my word, I can only summarize the U.S. financier's opinion. He acknowledged the need to help the restructuring of the Soviet economy. Financial aid was not being examined. The need for ruble convertibility was deemed strictly our internal affair. There is no conviction of the need to get involved in it. There is boundless confidence in the dollar's stability, and there were no fears that ruble convertibility would cause chaos on the money markets. My interlocutor could not understand our problems. Who needs a convertible ruble, for instance? The conversation was reminiscent of an interview: I asked the questions, he provided the answers. I only provided one answer: A hard-currency ruble must join the world economy.

The medieval money changer's view of the world as he sat on his bench ("banc" or "bank") among the rows of traders was restricted to the municipal square. News came in with merchant caravans that sometimes moved at the speed of camels. A broker or a modern banker can have a simultaneous view of the stock exchanges in New York, London, and Tokyo on his display and has to take information from around the whole world into consideration. The Soviet Union is seeking a place for itself on this kind of display. What image does it have at present? As a debtor, a business partner, a catalyst of anxiety, or a factor for stability—the definition and the choice of position depend to a considerable extent on the West, on its aid. The program for this aid is well-known: Financial loans, most-favored-nation status in trade, a reduction in the excessively long list of goods banned for export, speedier creation of joint enterprises, and aid for the latter's activity. Any discussion of economic aid begins and ends with the bank since ruble convertibility is the pledge of this program. It is necessary, but is it possible?

Let me cite examples that are little known in our country. Bulgaria has "called a spade a spade" and has fixed the dollar exchange rate. The country has authorized the free sale and purchase of hard currency and dollar-denominated accounts for all citizens. The result has been a gradual reduction in the official exchange rate. Zloty "internal convertibility" was introduced in Poland in the new year. This is one of the few points in Mazowiecki's program that have "worked." The increase of almost 20 percent in Polish exports is directly linked with it. Yugoslavia has made the dinar convertible.

Hard-currency backing ensures the feasibility of operations of this kind. Poland has obtained $1 billion from the IMF. Yugoslavia was also given backing. According to unofficial information, it will cost the FRG 50 billion marks to establish a single German currency. One can see that countries with varying levels of economic development are represented here. There is just one condition—purposeful hard-currency backing. The main result is to reduce inflation, increase exports, and even out the balance of trade. Why is the Soviet Union not on this list?

Some details are lost amid the majestic choir glorifying Soviet-U.S. trade relations. Yet they are symbolic. It is easy to see that President G. Bush is not agreeing lightly or immediately to the liberalization of U.S. trade and currency policy or to the creation of partnership relations with East Europe. On Malta he approved the Soviet Union's joining GATT and then agreed to U.S. involvement in setting up the European Reconstruction and Development Bank. Later the United States as part of the "Seven" supported a 50-percent increase in the size of IMF funds, attributing its decision to the "need to give East Europe credits." However, loans to the Soviet Union are conditional upon a number of reservations, above all the democratization of society and the liberalization of the economy. A new U.S.-Soviet trade agreement has been signed granting the Soviet Union most-favored-nation status. Its fulfillment depends on a number of conditions. But... THE WASHINGTON POST writes "about a clear policy of refusing the USSR financial aid." Yet it (and this is also clear to the nonspecialist) may be an important condition for the financial foundations of the current economic reform.

Instead of loans, people are speaking with increasing frequency in favor of a new "Marshall plan." Despite the outward similarity between the situation now and 40 years ago, this idea does not hold water. Europeans still remember well postwar U.S. aid to the afflicted countries. However, only specialists know the true cost of this aid. Commodities were supplied to West Europe under the "Marshall plan." The plan's implementation was combined with the reform of monetary circulation. It goes without saying that purchases of U.S. goods removed excess money and wore down the rate of inflation. The rate of economic development drastically increased in these countries. But... For instance, the West German population lost 95 percent of their savings kept in savings banks and almost 90 percent of their cash. Is a "Marshall plan" of this kind possible today? I think not.

"If I were..."—Springer, the journalist, invented this wording in postwar Hamburg. His newspaper printed readers' free advice which helped Springer become a millionaire. There you have it. "If I were a banker," I

would suggest a number of ideas to the IMF, the European Reconstruction and Development Bank, and other influential international financial organizations. I would first explain the kind of loans that the Soviet economy needs now and how urgently it needs them. One should evidently abandon any (now customary) regularization of these loans. Both in terms of size and duration. It would be a good idea to go further and not stipulate the purpose for which the money is to be used. In short, there should be complete liberalization.

Of course, all this will be at variance with universally recognized banking traditions that have become hallowed over the centuries. But the situation in East Europe is an unusual one today. I believe that profitability, like the interest charged on financial aid, should not only be expressed in monetary terms. It must also be evaluated in moral terms. It is, after all, a question of the prosperity (in the best and broadest sense) of the peoples of East Europe and even Eurasia. Their existence is an inalienable part of all human civilization.

Zagladin Views U.S.-Soviet Talks on Germany

AU0606112890 Hamburg BILD AM SONNTAG in German 3-4 Jun 90 p 2

[Interview with Vadim Zagladin, personal adviser of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, by Friedemann Weckbach-Mara; place and date not given: "Zagladin: Do Not Precipitate Things"]

[Text] [Weckbach-Mara] Has the Washington summit brought unification of the two German states a step closer?

[Zagladin] The main issue which has remained unresolved is the place that a future unified Germany will have in the alliance system. It was obvious that it would not be possible to resolve all issues at the same time because the USSR and the United States are not the only ones responsible in this respect. However, both sides understand the positions and concerns of the respective other side better now. Therefore, we may say that a step on the road to progress has been made.

[Weckbach-Mara] How soon and under which conditions can Germany now be unified?

[Zagladin] Precipitating things would be dangerous because it would rule out carefully considering all problems and the ways of solving them; however, excessively delaying things would be equally dangerous because it would contradict the people's mood. The speed of solving the external aspects on the road to Germany's unification—the borders, security, and the Four Powers' rights—depends on how constructively the partners in the negotiations, including the two German states, meet each other. The Soviet Union has suggested many variants which have, however, not met with understanding in the West. The West has so far failed to show imagination. It insists that a unified Germany stay in an unchanged NATO. In this way, new difficulties and new problems are being created, and new walls are being set up to replace the ones that were destroyed.

[Weckbach-Mara] When will the Soviet troops be withdrawn from German soil?

[Zagladin] Basically, we propose that the troops of all countries, that are deployed outside their national borders, should go home. As for the troops deployed on the territory of what is today the GDR, their withdrawal depends on when and above all how the external aspects of unification will be resolved.

Colonel Criticizes Global Shield Exercise

PM3105123390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 May 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel A. Alekseyev article: "Military Exercises: 'Global Shield'"]

[Text] Not so long ago General C. Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, voiced an idea that was quite original for a representative of the U.S. high military command. As THE WASHINGTON POST reported, he stated the desirability of dealing with the Soviet Union as a partner, rather than from the position of relations with a potential adversary.

And these words would carry still more weight if it were not for one circumstance. The statement was made while a large-scale exercise of the U.S. strategic forces, "Global Shield 90," was in full swing. These exercises, which have been carried out regularly since 1979, are a central event in the operational and combat training of the U Armed Forces on a global scale. They are usually acco panied by a series of other U.S. Ground Forces, Force, and Navy exercises carried out in conjunct with their NATO bloc partners. In this way a unifo operational and strategic background, simulating closely as possible the conditions of a genuine war situation, is created. A scenario of preparing, launching, and conducting an all-out conventional and nuclear war engulfing the North American continent, the Arctic regions, Europe, and the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Ocean zones, is played out.

A military rehearsal of this kind is conducted in pursuit of goals both in the sphere of military politics, and in that of military strategy. On the one hand it is a show of strength, of "deterrence," of the U.S. leadership's firm intentions to defend the United States' "vitally important interests." And on the other hand it is a comprehensive test of the combat readiness of the large strategic formations, combined units, and units of the U.S. strategic offensive and strategic defensive forces, a workout of plans for their combat deployment.

Officially the exercises are deemed to be the final scheduled annual event of the U.S. Air Forces Strategic Command, which includes ground-based strategic missile forces and strategic aviation. The commander of the Strategic Command is directly in charge of the forces and

weapon systems being diverted to the exercise. However, according to the U.S. press reports, the U.S. Navy's nuclear missile submarines also participate in these exercises, and so do most of the regular and reserve components of the Air Force, the North Atlantic Air Defense Command (NORAD), and Civil Defense organs and formations.

In the course of "Global Shield," there was a workout of the transfer of forces and weapon systems from a peace to a war footing, the dispersal of strategic aviation and nuclear submarines, and the increasing of bomber forces on forward defensive airfields near the Soviet Union's borders.

The climax of the exercises—and their scenario is repeated from year to year—involves the mass takeoff of strategic aircraft, the actual mock-combat and theoretical launch of ground- and sea-launched ICBM's, cruise missiles, and guided missiles, and bombing raids on the test sites.

The U.S. strategic offensive forces are capable of launching up to 15,000 nuclear warheads in a single rocket launch and sortie of bombers. The simulated combat deployment of the "strategic triad" in the exercises is organized completely in accordance with the requirements of U.S. nuclear strategy. The Single Integrated Operations Plan For Striking Strategic Targets (the SIOP plan), which was drafted in peace time, serves as the underlying document of strategic planning in which these principles are being implemented.

This nuclear war plan contains numerous options and combinations of "concentrated, "limited," "selective," and "regional" nuclear strikes, planned to be delivered against the USSR and other states in anticipatory and retaliatory operations. The SIOP plan is brought into operation on orders by the U.S. president. Strikes have been planned against strategic nuclear forces and armed forces objectives, state and military command posts, administrative and political centers, and industrial and economic regions.

It is difficult to accept that a large-scale wargame with so evil a scenario is really necessary for the defense of the United States and its allies. It is, of course, impossible to reconcile partnership and "deterrence." If the idea of partnership and cooperation are to safeguard the prevention of war, then "deterrence" carries a dangerous load of brinkmanship.

Space Experiment on Ozone Layer Planned

LD0106221490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1217 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Krupenik]

[Text] Leningrad, 1 Jun (TASS)—There are plans for Soviet and U.S. scientists to carry out a joint experiment on ozone layer studies from space this year. The intention is to install U.S. equipment for satellite observations aboard the Soviet automatic station "Meteor".

At the same time Soviet and U.S. aircraft, which have been fitted out as laboratories, will take off from predetermined areas of the earth. Working in conjunction with stations on the ground, they will make measurements in preset modes. The information so obtained will be speedily processed and transmitted to Soviet and U.S. research centers. Special attention will be paid to the state of the ozone layer above the polar regions, the Arctic and Antarctic.

Professor Anatoliy Buzinikov, co-chairman on the Soviet side of the bilateral research program, told a TASS correspondent that "the joint experiment was planned by a Soviet-U.S. working party on earth science. It was set up in accordance with the intergovernmental agreement on cooperation in exploration and use of space for peaceful purposes." The forthcoming space experiment is in keeping with the qualitatively new stage in relations between the USSR and the United States, he stressed.

San Francisco Group Invites Supsov Deputies

LD0106170490 Moscow TASS in English 0717 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Sidorin]

[Text] San Francisco June 1 TASS—Members of the recently founded "Democracy in Action" organisation, which has already won a high prestige, believe that the process of revolutionary transformations in the Soviet Union, on the success of which the state of affairs in the world will depend in many respects, as well as Soviet-American relations are at an exceptionally responsible, crucial stage of their development.

This is why, they maintain, it is particularly important for the two great powers—the United States and the Soviet Union—to broaden and deepen all-round contacts in every way, exchange experience in building state and social democratic structures and in developing openness.

The Democracy in Action organisation was founded by the most honorary people of the city of San Francisco—prominent businessmen, lawyers and public figures who have a wide experience in the field of international contacts.

Availing themselves of the auspicious political moment—the beginning of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's official visit to the United States and his forthcoming arrival in San Francisco soon, the leaders of the organisation came forward with a major and lofty initiative.

At a news conference here they announced that they invite all 542 members of the USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) to visit the United States, with the organisation fully bearing all transportation and other expenses involved in Soviet parliamentarians' stay in America.

"We are happy that President Gorbachev will be able to visit us here in California following the conclusion of the official part of the summit and to familiarise himself with how our business world, political and democratic

institutions function," Bernard Hagen, a prominent U.S. businessman, chairman of the organisation's board of directors, told TASS.

"Such familiarisation, as we see it, would be also of interest to all members of Soviet parliament who could possibly draw something new and useful for themselves to advance democratic reforms in the Soviet Union. After all, American democracy is more than 200 years old and has a considerable historical and practical experience," Hagen said.

"However, we intend not only to acquaint our distinguished Soviet guests with how institutions of democracy and government function at all levels in our country but also to have a frank talk with them about the existing drawbacks of our democratic system," Hegan went on to say.

"We also want them to see and learn America in all its diversity, tour various regions and cities of the country and stay with American families.

"At the same time such meetings will be exceptionally useful and enriching to us Americans as well. We hope to learn much from Soviet MPs, including their experience in sustaining democracy and carrying out reforms."

But perhaps the main thing in this programme, Hagen believes, is that Soviet law-makers carry away with them the Americans' genuinely warm feelings.

The American people are interested in a success of democratic transformations in the Soviet Union and wish it prosperity and peace, Hagen emphasised.

The suggested programme is intended for two or three years, the organisation's President John Jacobs, who until recently headed the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, told TASS.

The organisers of the programme are planning to receive 30-40 member groups of Soviet MPs.

Tours of the country by the groups will end in Washington where Soviet guests will be able to get a close look at the activities of the Congress and federal agencies.

The Democracy in Action project has roused a broad response in California and America's other states. The project, which will need three to seven million dollars, will be financed exclusively by private donations from public organisations and individuals.

"Our idea has many enthusiastic supporters and we intend to begin to implement it this year. It is only through close contacts, mutual knowledge, the strengthening of mutual understanding and trust that our two people will be able to create firm guarantees of peace and democracy," Jacob stressed.

Official on Soviet-U.S. Humanitarian Cooperation

LD3005161790 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—The United States and the Soviet Union have begun to discuss a "new agenda" of humanitarian cooperation, Yuriy Reshetov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights, told TASS.

He said that the USSR and the U.S. had recently begun to discuss a number of new humanitarian problems.

First, he mentioned joint actions dealing with the analysis of all aspects of the functioning of a law-governed state. Reshetov pointed to the significance of a Soviet-American seminar held in Moscow this year, which was attended by prominent lawyers from both countries and senior executives of the Soviet Ministry of Justice and the U.S. Justice Department.

Second, the "new agenda" includes social issues, specifically, the problem of the disabled and of people with inborn defects, as well as the situation of the aged.

"These are specific humanitarian problems which deserve a particular attention of both countries," he stressed.

At the same time, the exchange of views on the "old agenda" (the analysis of cases on which the sides had complaints) will be continued, but will be of less importance than before, Reshetov said. He mentioned the exchange of lists with names of people. "During the Malta summit the American side handed to the Soviet side a list of 56 people about whom, the Americans believed, there were grounds to believe that they were kept behind bars not only on criminal charges," he recalled.

Thirty people whose names were on the list, have already been released. On the same occasion, Reshetov continued, the Soviet side handed to American officials a list of 40 names, mostly anti-war activists sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. Practically none have been released, the Soviet diplomat said.

An-225 Planned for Display in Oklahoma

LD0306220490 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] The Soviet plane Antonov-255, otherwise known as Mriya, whose freight carrying capacity is the greatest in the world, will be presented at the upcoming international aerospace show in the American city of Oklahoma. Soviet and American experts are studying the possibility of jointly using it as a mobile launching site for small manned spacecraft.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Visits Ontario

LD0106215490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent Sergey Kuznetsov]

[Excerpts] Toronto, 1 Jun (TASS)—The official visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by Rafik N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, began on Thursday with a visit to the parliament of Ontario, Canada's largest province in terms of population. The Soviet parliamentarians are in the land of the maple leaf at the invitation of the Canadian federal parliament. [passage omitted]

The head of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation noted that the Soviet parliamentarians sensed the kind attitude of Canadians toward our country from the first moments of their stay on Canadian soil. "It is necessary to fill that attitude with specific content, dynamically developing ties in all areas of mutual interest," he stressed. "The meetings held with Brian Mulroney, prime minister of Canada, during M.S. Gorbachev's visit have laid down the most favorable conditions for such cooperation." R.N. Nishanov expressed hope that the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's visit to the Ontario Parliament will open up new fields in the development of bilateral parliamentary ties.

The Soviet guests were acquainted in detail with the activity of the provincial parliament and the members' working conditions and their rights and obligations. They toured the parliament building and attended one of its sittings. The statement by the speaker of parliament that a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation was present in the gallery for guests of honor was received with applause by the members. [passage omitted]

That evening, the Toronto Trade Council, which brings together many leading Canadian companies, held a reception in honor of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation. [passage omitted]

"Although our delegation regards the development of interparliamentary ties, first and foremost, as the main task of its visit, we consider the development of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and Canada as extremely important," R.N. Nishanov noted. "But it is necessary to diversify and extend these ties and, in particular, to activate more fully the two countries' potential in the field of complex technologies. We must hasten to exploit the new opportunities which have opened up."

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation leaves on Friday [1 June] for Montreal, the largest city of the French-speaking Province of Quebec.

The delegation of Soviet parliamentarians is being accompanied on its tour of the country by Aleksey A. Rodionov, the USSR's ambassador to Canada.

Delegation Continues Canadian Tour

LD0306224290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1715 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Montreal, 3 June. (TASS)—TASS special correspondent Sergey Kuznetsov reports: The official visit to Canada by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation led by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, is continuing. It is on a trip around the country at the invitation of the Canadian Parliament.

After visiting Niagara Falls, the Soviet parliamentarians arrived in Montreal, one of the most important towns in the French-speaking province of Quebec, aboard a Canadian Air Force plane provided by the Canadian Government. The delegation toured this major trade and industrial, financial, and cultural centre of the country on Saturday. [passage omitted]

(Jean Charay), a prominent figure in the ruling Canadian Progressive Conservative Party and a deputy from a district of Montreal, gave a reception in honour of the Soviet parliamentarians. [passage omitted]

The head of the delegation of Soviet parliamentarians replied, expressing the hope that the visit to Canada by M.S. Gorbachev which has just ended will give new impetus to the development of relations between the two countries. "There are no problems between our two countries which could not be resolved in a spirit of goodwill through talks, he said. The only area in which we would like to remain rivals is ice hockey."

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation leaves for Quebec, the capital of the Canadian province which bears the same name, on Saturday. It will continue to acquaint itself with the activity of the local authority bodies there.

Canadian Warships Arrive in Vladivostok

LD0306110590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0920 gmt 3 Jun 90

[Text] Vladivostok, 3 June, (TASS)—By agreement a detachment of Canadian warships arrived in Golden Horn Bay today on an official visit. Under the flag of Rear Admiral (P. Cairns), Commander of the Canadian Navy's Pacific Fleet, the detachment consists of the destroyers Huron and Kootenay, the frigate Annapolis and the tanker Provider.

Northeast Asia

DPRK 'Reaction' to Gorbachev-No Meeting

LD0606185490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Speaking about the USSR president's stay in the United States, many among the mass media stress the great significance of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with No Tae-u, president of South Korea. It is noted that this step matches the spirit of the times, being

in line with the interests not only of the two countries, but also of normalization of the situation throughout the Asia-Pacific region. Moreover it is a step which does nobody any harm. Well, there is a natural question: What has been the attitude to this meeting in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea? I asked our correspondent in Pyongyang, Konstantin Belov, to reply to this question.

[Begin Belov recording] Today it is still very difficult to speak about the reaction of the mass media in the DPRK to the meeting held in San Francisco between USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and South Korea's President No Tae-u. The fact is that neither the press here nor the television or radio have so far said a word even about Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States. For that reason one can for the time being only make suppositions about what the official reaction to this fact will be. The mass media here precisely reflect the official position of the DPRK Government.

What can one base one's suppositions on? For example, yesterday, 5 June, a press conference was held by a young South Korean businessman, (Kan Hung-Goo), who recently went over to the DPRK. The question of a foreign journalist accredited here about attitudes to the meeting between Gorbachev and No Tae-u obviously took both him and the organizers of the press conference by surprise. Nevertheless, he stated that No Tae-u was not one who desired unification. His course is directed only towards division. The present South Korean dictatorship, said (Kan Hung-goo), is worse than all the preceding ones. All South Koreans hate No Tae-u, and it is incomprehensible why the USSR's president met him. A meeting with such a person is pointless, (Kan Hung-goo) stressed. However, this reply did not find its way into the report of the press conference published today, 6 June, in the central newspaper NODONG SINMUN.

One could also quote one report of the KCNA news agency distributed on 31 May, only on foreign channels. It sets out a reply by a DPRK Foreign Ministry spokesman to a question from the agency's correspondent about rumors concerning the expected meeting between Gorbachev and No Tae-u. We think, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said, that the president of the Soviet Union, which has relations of alliance with us, is quite capable of drawing conclusions about what serious political consequences would ensue from a meeting with a character such as No Tae-u, who is interested only in the division of Korea. One could not in any circumstances either approve of or agree to actions that hinder the cause of unification. That is the immutable, principled position of the DPRK Foreign Ministry.

But that was before the meeting in San Francisco. We will just have to wait for reaction to the actual meeting. [end recording]

Never mind, we will wait.

Army Workers Party Visit to DPRK Summed Up

PM2905130390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 May 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation of Soviet political workers headed by Lieutenant General V.I. Grebenyuk, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, was in the DPRK 14 through 22 May.

The delegation of Soviet political workers was received by Korean People's Army Vice Marshal O Chin-u, member of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee Politburo, DPRK minister of the People's Armed Forces, and director of the Korean People's Army General Political Bureau. During the meetings and conversations, which took place in a warm and friendly atmosphere, they exchanged experience of party political work within the USSR and DPRK Armed Forces to fulfill the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the Sixth WPK Congress. The Soviet political workers described the progress of perestroyka being implemented within our country and the Soviet Armed Forces and the preparations for the 28th party congress.

The delegation visited a number of troop units, where they were familiarized with the life and combat training of Korean People's Army soldiers. A rally was held at the Kim Il-song Military Political Academy which was a clear demonstration of the friendship and combat solidarity existing between the two armies' soldiers.

Mongolian Democratic Party Officially Recognized

LD2505181290 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 25 May 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar May 25 TASS—The Collegium of the Supreme Court of Mongolia has registered the Mongolian Democratic Party (MDP). It was set up in February and held its constituent congress in April. This most radical party has 7,200 members, predominantly young people.

The MDP is the fourth party to gain recognition. Together with the Mongolian Social-Democratic Party and the Mongolian Party of National Progress, the MDP formed a coalition to take part in the general elections to the Mongolian Hural of People's Deputies on July 29.

Biryukova Views Lessons of Japanese Industry

PM0606154990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Interview in Tokyo with A.P. Biryukova, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, by own correspondent I. Latyshev; place and date unspecified: "We Share Good Ideals"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] A.P. Biryukova, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, visited Japan last week at the invitation of the Japanese Government and the leadership of the "EXPO-90" international flower exhibition, which is currently being held in Osaka with the participation of 84 countries and 50 different international organizations. She shared her impressions in an interview with your correspondent:

I was last in Japan some 20 years ago as a secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions. And now I have had another opportunity to take a look at this country. I will state frankly that both Tokyo and Osaka have changed beyond recognition since then. The Japanese have done a great deal to improve the environment. I recall that during my first visit the air in the streets was literally poisoned by vehicle exhaust gases, and I had the impression that we were driving in thick smoke. Today I get a different feeling: As though all motor transport in Japan runs not on liquid fuel but on electricity. You are not aware of exhaust fumes: The atmosphere over Osaka, where I have spent three days, is quite different now.

Masses of high-rise buildings have been constructed in Osaka and Tokyo. Many of them are modern hotels, where the standard of service is extremely high. I also visited an Osaka department store—not the biggest one. I was impressed not so much by the organization of the trade system as by the very wide range of goods: Absolutely everything that customers might need was on sale. This applies to both food and household goods.

I have met with representatives of the country's business circles and visited several industrial enterprises. In the environs of Osaka I visited a textile factory and a sewn goods factory, as well as a machine-building plant producing textile machinery and equipment for the chemical industry. To speak of my impression of the visit to that plant, I was struck by the totally different approach to the utilization, improvement, and servicing of equipment. Different even in comparison with the practice in our defense complex. Each of the plant's laboratories is itself quite a large enterprise which simultaneously improves on several modifications of one and the same product. In this the working of every assembly and component is studied, and they are finished carefully, so that the quality of the plant's output meets the highest world requirements. Only after this is the best product put into production. And as long as a particular type of machine is in production at the enterprise, the firm's laboratories do not cease working to improve it.

At that plant, incidentally, we familiarized ourselves with a fundamentally new spinning machine, put into series production this year. This machine makes it possible to obtain high-quality yarn with a productivity 2.5-3 times greater than the machines currently operating in Japan, including those created 18 to 24 months ago.

At one of the same firm's textile enterprises we also saw the work of a loom with a productivity 4-4.5 times higher than the very best of the looms produced in the Soviet Union. And this is what is interesting: Japanese machine builders in their laboratories and their design and technological bureaus go on continuously studying the work of the machines they produce. And not just in Japan itself but also outside the country. They have a thorough knowledge of where and how their machines work abroad, and they service them. Some 180 looms had been set up in the shop which I visited. Yet only four people work there per shift. It is essentially an automated shop, where all the main operations are carried out with the extensive use of computers.

A total of 1,500 people work at a machine-building plant which we visited. Of these, 250 are permanently employed on improving and finishing the equipment being produced, while 30-50 people work for the long term. It is their task to create fundamentally new equipment. For this everything new that appears in the world is purchased—licenses, patents. In general, Japanese textile enterprises are at least 25-30 years ahead of ours.

And another observation connected with the fact that the USSR Supreme Soviet is now discussing the Law on Taxation. They organize taxation in such a way that it is not advantageous for entrepreneurs to work with the same equipment for more than five years. The equipment depreciation time at the weaving enterprise which we visited is just three years. I asked the owner of that enterprise: "What will you do in three years' time, when the looms have paid for themselves?" He replied: "I will begin retooling once again. Something new must be introduced!" What a response. In our country equipment very often works for 25-30 years and sometimes even longer. If we really want to give people fine clothes and footwear, we will certainly have to make a steep turn in retooling those sectors of industry that produce consumer goods. Today even we already have individual textile enterprises which have begun the fundamental replacement of equipment. Approximately one billion rubles has already been allocated to this. However, many other enterprises are still incapable in practice of ensuring the proper level of labor productivity and product quality.

As regards the general prospects for developing economic, scientific, and cultural contacts between the Soviet Union and Japan, in my view they inspire optimism. Take our cultural contacts, for example. They are developing very actively. The Japanese people give our musicians a warm welcome, for example. Incidentally, Svetlanov is now in Japan with his celebrated symphony orchestra. Moscow operetta artistes performed at a concert given at the Osaka exhibition on Soviet Union Day. They were given an exceptionally warm welcome. And such contacts must undoubtedly develop. The same can be said of economic, scientific, and technical ties between our two countries. It is true that these ties, particularly economic ties, have so far developed through traditional channels—chiefly along the line of

trade in goods that both countries need. And new, progressive forms of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation are still in embryo. I have in mind the creation of joint ventures, production cooperatives, etc.

It is gratifying that in connection with perestroyka and under the influence of the new thinking a new negotiating mechanism has also appeared in the sphere of intergovernmental Soviet-Japanese relations: In particular, working groups have been set up under the two countries' foreign ministries to prepare a peace treaty, representatives of various state establishments have begun meeting more frequently, and contacts are expanding along parliamentary lines, as well as between public organizations, including contacts between the Liberal Democratic Party and the CPSU.

In conclusion, about the "EXPO-90" flower show, to which we were invited in connection with Soviet Union Day. This exhibition is taking place under the motto "Ensuring man's harmony with the environment." The aim of its organizers is to promote the noble cause of educating people in the spirit of a careful, solicitous, and benevolent attitude to nature and one another. We share those good ideals.

Article on Japanese 'Northern Territories' Issue

PM0506155190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Rodin article: "Japanese Rightwingers Demand 'Return' of Kuril Islands By Force of Arms"]

[Text] The extensive campaign of territorial claims against the Soviet Union in Japan has intensified recently. As reports in the Japanese mass media show, the latest upsurge in this campaign is closely linked to the activation of political dialogue between the Soviet Union and Japan and the resumption of the Soviet-Japanese peace treaty talks. It is well known that Tokyo is artificially making the development of the whole range of bilateral relations and the conclusion of a peace treaty dependent on the solution of the far-fetched territorial problem (on Japan's terms, of course). As political observers in Tokyo note, that is why a massive conditioning of public opinion is under way, to pressure the Soviet side and reinforce the Japanese position at the talks.

The subject of Japan's territorial claims against the Soviet Union is the so-called "northern territories"—a concept which is interpreted in two ways in Tokyo. Some take it to mean the southern part of the Greater Kuril chain (Iturup and Kunashir plus adjacent islands) as well as the islands of the Lesser Kuril chain (Shikotan and the Khabomai group of islands). Others include all the Kuril islands and the southern part of Sakhalin in the "northern territories."

The invalidity of these claims is obvious, because the territorial question with Japan was settled by a whole series of international agreements which enshrined the results of World War II and are still valid.

Nevertheless, the so-called "movement for the return of the northern territories" exists in Japan: Official Tokyo portrays it as an autonomous public movement. However, it is common knowledge that this "movement" is directed by a staff specially created within the prime minister's office. The staff is headed by the chief of the prime minister's office, who has the rank of state minister. Rallies, congresses, competitions, and other national and local events are organized using money allocated annually from the state budget to that staff as well as to prefectural and municipal organs of power (primarily in northern Japan). Every encouragement is given to the creation and activity of exiles' associations and committees from among former residents or their relatives (including second and third generations)—emigrants or those living temporarily on Sakhalin island or the Kuril islands.

On the staff's "initiative," the Japanese Government adopted a decision in 1981 to proclaim 7 February "Northern Territories Day." A vacation center was organized in the Nemuro region on Hokkaido, where they built a "house of longing for the motherland," a "northern territories observation tower," and other installations equipped with telescopes through which people can see the islands of the Lesser Kuril chain. The authorities are trying to involve trade unions and women's, youth, and other social organizations in the campaign. Special attention is paid to the enlistment of schoolchildren.

One cannot overlook the position and actions of another group of political forces in Japan who are trying to make their contribution to the territorial claims campaign. Its representatives, who tend primarily toward the military department, are trying to link the territorial problem to the thesis of the "Soviet military threat." In particular, they regard the presence of Soviet troops on the Kurils as "a demonstration of military strength and a form of strong-arm pressure." Having clearly lost their sense of reality, they are proposing their own solution to the territorial problem, the content of which has been set out in a number of items in publications close to the Japanese Defense Agency. The gist of them is... the armed seizure of the Kuril Islands.

To achieve this it is proposed to create a contingent of multipurpose forces consisting of a motorized division, a marine division, and airborne assault units and to equip them with modern landing and assault facilities. The strategists' scheme is that these forces could conduct an operation that the USSR would not expect—they could carry out a large marine and airborne landing, consolidate their hold on the captured territory, and present the Soviet Union with a fait accompli. If necessary they could resort to the help of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Publications like that should probably not be taken seriously. However, the existence of them itself emphasizes yet again how unpredictable the results of policy toward a neighboring country can be when it is founded on territorial claims.

The "northern territories" problem is the progeny of the Cold War. It was created artificially in the mid-fifties when the Soviet-Japanese peace treaty was being prepared. At that time this problem was foisted on Japan primarily by outside forces so as to prevent the complete normalization of Soviet-Japanese relations.

Meanwhile the world is changing radically. Relations in the world community are gradually being built on new principles, which have already shown their beneficial and creative character. The main ideas of these principles are Realism, consideration of a balance of the countries' interests, and mutual respect. Recent events have shown that in the modern world only civilized countries and peoples who observe these principles and respect themselves can build interstate relations and conduct foreign policy activity successfully.

Japanese Fishing Crews To Stand Trial in Nakhodka

OW0506142990 Tokyo KYODO in English 0903 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 5 KYODO—Twelve North Korean-registered fishing boats with largely Japanese crews seized by Soviet authorities last month for allegedly poaching salmon in the northern Pacific arrived Tuesday at the Far East Soviet port of Nakhodka, Soviet Fisheries Ministry officials said.

According to Soviet sources, all the crew members of the ships believed to have been leased from a Japanese firm, including some 170 Japanese fishermen, are expected to stand trial in Nakhodka from the end of this week to early next week.

The sources also suggested that the trial will likely take two days.

In Tokyo, the Japanese Foreign Ministry said it had received a report from the Japanese Consulate in Nakhodka confirming the arrival of the ships.

The 12 fishing vessels, with North Korean registration numbers painted over their Japanese names and flying North Korean flags, were seized by Soviet authorities around May 20 for allegedly taking salmon spawned in Soviet rivers from the seas off the Kamchatka peninsula.

Japan's Oita Prefecture Seeks 'Direct Ties'

PM0506110390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Single Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "Japanese Governor's Visit"]

[Text] M. Hiramatsu, governor of Japan's Oita Prefecture who is visiting our country at the invitation of Russia's Council of Ministers, held talks at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Foreign Ministry and the RSFSR Ministry of Local Industry in Moscow 4 June.

The Japanese visitor expressed interest in the establishment of direct ties between his prefecture and one of Russia's oblasts. Despite the fact that Oita is not very large, its governor ranks third in popularity after his counterparts from Tokyo and Osaka. The secret lies in the fact that in just over 10 years, under M. Hiramatsu's leadership and without any patronage from central departments or major state subsidies, Oita has turned from a backwater into one of Japan's developed agro-industrial regions.

During the conversations, the Soviet side noted the importance of studying the Japanese experience as regards implementing the processes of transforming the republic's economy and social sphere.

Kalinin Views Okinawa's Reversion Anniversary

OW2005193190 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 15 May 90

[By military commentator Kalinin]

[Text] Listeners! A Japan-U.S. Treaty on the Reversion of Okinawa went into effect 18 years ago or on 15 May 1972. In this connection, Moscow Radio military commentator Kalinin writes as follows:

Eighteen years have passed since Okinawa reverted to Japanese rule. However, Okinawa's reversion was of a formal nature and Okinawa's role as a major military stronghold of the U.S. Department of Defense in the Far East has not changed. According to an article in the ARMED FORCES JOURNAL, an American military magazine, the U.S. Government sees Okinawa as the most important military stronghold in the western Pacific. Therefore, it is no accident that three-fourths of U.S. bases and training grounds in Japan are concentrated on Okinawa. Among those bases is Kadena Air Base where a tactical fighter wing, the strongest air combat unit in the region, is deployed. The Third Marine Corps Division is stationed on Okinawa with the aim of mobilizing to various military action points. About 20 percent of the Okinawan area is occupied by military facilities and this indicates how much Okinawa is militarized. What is dangerous is that Okinawa is caught up in the American nuclear strategy. Strategic communications facilities are located in Okinawa to prepare for nuclear war. White Beach Port has been used as a logistic support base for U.S. nuclear-powered submarines. In addition, Kadena Air Base has been used as a transit base for strategic bomber B-52s flying in from Guam Island. On Okinawa, there are air units assigned to the U.S. Marine Crops to transport nuclear-war heads. We can not rule out the possibility of U.S. forces keeping nuclear weapons in Okinawa. For example, House of Representatives Member Nagasaki of the Democratic Socialist Party expressed his view on this possibility at a Diet session last February.

I would like to mention another important thing. The Okinawan people have been faced with difficulties caused by the uncontrolled actions of the U.S. Department of Defense. U.S. forces have conducted live-fire training in densely populated areas, leading to incidents endangering the lives of residents living near the training grounds. In view of more than 30,000 cases of crime committed by American soldiers since Okinawa's reversion to Japanese rule, we can understand how the Okinawan people live under extremely dangerous circumstances. It is quite natural that these crimes are fueling resentment among the Okinawan people. According to a poll outcome announced by the Prime Minister's Office on 14 May, three out of five Okinawans did not recognize the need for U.S. bases and saw their presence as a threat to Japan's security. The number of people taking this view increased by 6.8 percent compared with the 1985 poll. A spokesman for the Okinawa Development Agency pointed that this attitude of the Okinawan people toward the presence of U.S. bases is attributable to easing East-West relations and base-related incidents. As DISARMAMENT ISSUE, a monthly magazine, recently pointed out, the Okinawan people's unity and organizing capabilities for struggles against the presence of the U.S. military have become conspicuous compared with other parts of Japan.

Under this situation, the United States is taking measures to prevent antiwar actions from further escalating. For example, the return of some military facilities to the Japanese side is under review. It appears to be welcome progress. However, there are two points we should keep in mind. First, facilities under consideration by the U.S. side for return to the Japanese side are nothing more than auxiliary ones. Second, in the mid-1970s, the United States committed itself to return 23 percent of the total area allotted for use by the military facilities in Okinawa to Japan. Nonetheless, the United States has only fulfilled part of its commitment. Therefore, it is premature to see how long it will take for the United States to fulfill the commitment. There is a clear thing. It is just that the presence of the U.S. forces has not brought any benefit not only to the Okinawan people, but to the entire Japanese people. Their presence is in conflict with the growing trend of easing military confrontations in the world.

As I have mentioned earlier, the Soviet Union proposed the removal of all foreign military bases by the year 2000. The Soviet Union is withdrawing its troops from East European nations and Mongolia. In addition, the Soviet military presence in Cam Ranh Bay of Vietnam has been substantially scaled back. In this connection, what is important is not to see these Soviet disarmament actions as unilateral actions of the Soviet side. At this time when we are greeting the 18th anniversary of Okinawa's reversion to Japanese rule, there are many reasons for us to think of this point.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Addresses UN Meeting in Bangkok

LD0506201290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0906 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Bangkok, 5 Jun (TASS)—TASS correspondent Boris Chekhonin reports: Economic restructuring and the social-economic development of the APR [Asian-Pacific Region] countries remains the center of attention of more than 300 delegates from 48 countries who have gathered at the Thai capital for the 46th session of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). During the second day of discussion by participants in the representative forum, it was stressed that nuclear disarmament and stable peace in our world are an indispensable condition for the prosperity of the vast region where over half of mankind lives. In this connection, delegates highly appreciate the importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit that has just ended in the United States.

In the forum today, the participants listened with great attention to the speech of Igor Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister. His statement that the results of the summit will benefit not only the USSR and the United States, but will also strengthen the foundations of peace and common security and impart a powerful impulse to the renewal of international relations along the lines of new political thinking, was greeted with applause.

The Soviet Union, the speaker said, notes with satisfaction the vigorous search for solutions to many acute regional problems and the proximity of large-scale changes in Southeast Asia, where transition from confrontation to dialogue is gaining strength. The head of the Soviet delegation expressed approval of and support for Thailand's and Japan's constructive efforts toward establishing peace in Cambodia. He positively appraised ESCAP's role in restructuring the economy and raising the living standards of the APR peoples. At the same time, the speaker stressed the need to further increase the effectiveness of its activity and creatively review the work programs and the commission's projects for the nineties.

In response to the broad interest of delegates in the economic restructuring processes in the USSR, I.A. Rogachev gave an analysis of our achievements and difficulties in this area and thanked APR states for their support. We see in this, he said, yet another proof of the increased potential for trust and cooperation in the region. The speaker noted that in 1989 the commodity circulation between the USSR and the region's countries amounted to $24 billion. N.I. Ryzhkov's visit to Thailand, Australia, and Singapore, which took place this year, opens up new ways to further develop the Soviet Union's foreign economic links with the countries of this part of the world. To raise the population's living standards and solve social problems, I.A. Rogachev stated, the Soviet Union is converting from an economy of

armament to an economy of disarmament. By 1995, the USSR's military budget will have been reduced 1.5-2 times.

The 46th ESCAP session is continuing work. Heads of the delegations from India, Singapore, Pakistan, Mongolia, and other countries spoke at a plenary session today.

Meets Thai Officials

LD0606205290 Moscow TASS in English 2042 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Chekhonin]

[Text] Bangkok June 7 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Ivan Rogachev and Thai Deputy Foreign Minister Kasem Kasemisi [name as received] met for regular political consultations here on Wednesday. The Soviet diplomat also met Thai Foreign Minister Sitthi Sawetsila within the framework of the consultations. The sides exchanged views on the urgent international and regional problems as well as Soviet-Thai relations.

The Thai representatives praised the role played by President Mikhail Gorbachev in the process of further development of constructive interaction between the Soviet Union and the United States in the international arena and in the achievement of new Soviet-U.S. agreements.

They expressed sincere wishes of success to perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

The sides examined ways to normalize the situation in the South-East Asia, including specific steps that can be taken to finalise the Cambodian settlement.

In this context, the importance was stressed of continuing the search by two Cambodian sides for a compromise solution, relating, first of all, to a set of military aspects of the issue, to the ensuring of the continuity of the inter-Khmer talks and making the agreements reached in their course solid and irreversible. This could be facilitated by cutting military supplies to Cambodia from other countries.

The representatives of the two countries confirmed their desire to continue and deepen the mutually useful political dialogue, expand commercial and economic relations and develop other forms of contacts.

Soviet Ambassador to Thailand A.I. Valkov took part in the consultations.

On the same day Rogachev held a news conference for Thai and foreign journalists at the Thailand Foreign Ministry.

Commentary on Sen-Sihanouk Communique in Tokyo

BK0606124190 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Station observer Oleg Alekseyev's commentary]

[Text] Comrade Hun Sen, head of the Cambodian Government, and Samdech Sihanouk, leader of the Cambodian opposition factions, signed a joint communique in Tokyo appealing to all warring parties to stop their fighting and take part in an international meeting to find a political solution to the Cambodian situation.

Our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, makes the following comments:

In my opinion, it is not necessary to demonstrate how important it is to completely cease the fighting in Cambodia. Without a cease-fire, there would be no possibility of dealing fruitfully with the other important political steps, such as holding UN-supervised general elections in Cambodia in order to form a viable national reconciliation government. In this context, the cease-fire appeal made by Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Sihanouk to all parties involved in the conflict constitutes an event of undeniably great significance. It is, however, necessary to point out that, in the name of peace, this appeal will not lead to a definitive cessation of the fratricidal war in Cambodia. Such a view is held by virtually every journalist covering the Tokyo meeting. One has sufficient grounds to draw such a conclusion.

Certainly, Samdech Sihanouk has invariably been regarded as the most authoritative leader of the Cambodian opposition groups. However, he maintains a most complex relationship with the Khmer Rouge which forms the strongest and most belligerent faction on the opposition side, and this relationship was demonstrated from the start at the Tokyo meeting.

As reported by various news agencies, because of the negative behavior of Khmer Rouge leader Khieu Samphan, the meeting was almost deadlocked just minutes after its opening. This situation was averted thanks to the energetic efforts of Thai Deputy Prime Minister Chawalit Yongchaiyut and PRC Ambassador to Japan Yang Zhenya.

Noteworthy is the fact that Khieu Samphan categorically refused to commit himself to the cease-fire appeal. Would the Khmer Rouge, who field the most powerful fighting forces in the armed resistance against Phnom Penh, listen to the voice of reason and put an end to the meaningless bloodshed? In posing this question, observers have taken into consideration other factors besides the gesture made in Tokyo by the representative of the Khmer Rouge. No one has forgotten the statement

issued by Samdech Sihanouk prior to the Tokyo meeting. Addressing journalists, Samdech said that even if the cease-fire agreement was signed, the Khmer Rouge would never give up their armed struggle.

Nevertheless, we wish to conclude this commentary on an optimistic note. Indeed, the joint appeal of Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Sihanouk will play an important if not vital role in creating conditions for a cease-fire in Cambodia. In particular, their joint statement has received virtually unanimous approval and support of the international community. In this connection, observers note the active and extremely constructive role of China. There is another important opportunity to achieve peace in Cambodia coming up. As we have mentioned above, Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Sihanouk called for the resumption of talks within the framework of the Paris international conference on Cambodia. This certainly is a road full of opportunities. It is now clear, therefore, that a comprehensive solution for Cambodia cannot be found without the active contribution of all states interested in this issue.

Vietnam's Nguyen Van Linh Meets With Ambassador

LD0606154190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0855 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Hanoi, 6 Jun (TASS)—Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee, has had a meeting here with D.I. Kachin, USSR ambassador to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

As is noted in reports by the central press, during the conversation, which took place in a frank and friendly atmosphere, the Vietnamese leader informed the Soviet ambassador about the first important achievements reached in the renewal of all spheres of Vietnamese society, and indicated the economic and social problems facing the party and people of Vietnam. The USSR ambassador told the general secretary of the CPV Central Committee about the course of perestroyka and about topical events in the Soviet Union.

Nguyen Van Linh expressed confidence that the Soviet people, with their stallwart revolutionary traditions, will be able to overcome all difficulties and tests and will successfully carry out perestroyka in the interests of strengthening socialism. He wished Soviet Communists success in holding the 28th CPSU Congress.

East Europe

Czechoslovakia's Havel Meets Yeltsin in Moscow

LD0706072190 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 0700 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] President Vaclav Havel met in Moscow today Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. They discussed changes in Czechoslovakia and in the Russian Federation with Marian Calfa, federal premier, and Jiri Dientsbier, minister of foreign affairs.

They also dealt with possibilities of future relations between the two sides when sovereignty of the Russian Federation is declared.

Hungarian Socialist Party Congress Viewed

PM2905145190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch under the rubric "From the Countries of Eastern Europe": "Hungary: Sharp Turn"]

[Text] Budapest, 27 May—The Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] Congress was held last October, and ended up as the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP] Congress. During the MSZP Congress just now there has been a sharp turn toward social democracy, a new leadership has been elected, and the statutes brought up to date.

It was noted at plenary sittings and during the sessions that Hungary has made the transition to multiparty democracy peacefully. To a large extent this was facilitated by socialist reformers. The MSZP will continue to proclaim democratic socialism, strive to strengthen the rule-of-law state, and defend socially-oriented market relations and a mixed economy. As the opposition force in parliament (33 seats—8.5 percent), the MSZP intends to seek the optimum means of combining state, cooperative, and private ownership.

R. Nyers, chairman of the MSZP—whose speech also voiced the idea of a turn toward social democratic principles—called for the renewal of the party leadership and quit his post. The congress elected G. Horn (Hungary's former foreign minister) as MSZP chairman. I. Pozsgay and D. Yanoshi [name as transliterated] have been elected his deputies. The composition of the MSZP presidium and the MSZP board have been renewed.

Congress Discusses Party's Tasks

PM3105125990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Correspondent F. Lukyanov dispatch under "Events, Facts, Opinions" rubric: "MSZP: Congress in Opposition"]

[Text] Budapest—The Hungarian Socialists, who were until recently in power, are today holding their second congress in a completely new situation—in opposition. In the recent parliamentary elections the MSZP [Hungarian Socialist Party] collected 11 percent of the votes.

Addressing the congress, party chairman Rezso Nyers noted that in the past eight months huge changes have taken place not only in Hungary, but also in the whole of Eastern Europe. They have not everywhere taken place

within the framework of laws and parliaments. In this respect Hungary was notable for the fact that the ruling party began to implement reforms without waiting for demands from the street. The main task which the MSZP set at its first congress in October of last year—the peaceful transition to a multiparty system and the creation of a parliamentary democracy—has been achieved. However, at the same time, as was noted in the board's report, the organization of an essentially new party, which effectively coincided with the holding of the election campaign, did not enable the new leadership to respond properly to the attacks of its rivals, and there was frequently a lack of solidarity in the leadership as well.

Finding itself now in opposition, the MSZP, as the sole representative of left-wing forces in parliament, in the words of Rezso Nyers, must assume the defense of the interests of working people, the majority of the country's population. The MSZP, the chairman stated, will continue to regard itself as the party of workers, cooperativized peasants and peasant farmers, the intelligentsia, and small entrepreneurs. In its activity the MSZP will draw on the traditions of the social democratic and socialist movements united by the Socialist International.

While advocating a social market and gradual movement toward world prices, the Socialists will also fight at the same time to ensure that the pay of Hungarian workers reaches world levels. In these conditions cooperation with all left-wing forces in the country, the trade unions, and the workers councils becomes for the MSZP one of the main directions in its future work.

New Hungarian Premier's Program Aims Reported

PM3005100990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 May 90 p 5

[Own correspondent A. Kaverznev dispatch: "Optimistic Strategy"]

[Text] Budapest—"What has happened during the last two years knows no precedent either in Hungarian history or possibly even in the history of all Europe. Without spilling a drop of blood we have accomplished a revolution, becoming pioneers in our region."

These are words from a speech delivered by Jozsef Antall at a Hungarian parliamentary session while he was still a contender for the post of prime minister. In the almost two-hour speech, Antall set out his main government aims which permit a judgment to be made of the new regime's strategic tasks.

The candidate for the premiership singled out four principles which will determine the cabinet's activities. First: a government of freedom. As is laid down in a rule-of-law state, all Hungarian citizens will enjoy the same rights and responsibilities before the law and the authorities and in relation to each another. Full press, cultural, and educational freedom is guaranteed and entrepreneurs' freedom is restored. The second principle: a government of the people. The system of repression is being replaced by a system of freedoms. Citizens should regard state institutions as their own. The third principle: a government of economic reforms. The introduction of a market economy, which will take into account social interests and environmental protection demands. And finally, the fourth principle: a government of Europe and inclusion in European integration. Hungary proposes to join the Council of Europe by the end of this year and the EEC within a decade.

Much pontificating; but it is hard to expect anything different from a prime minister who took office only the other day. It is obvious, however, that social and political stability in the country can be secured only by the successful resolution of economic problems.

Jozsef Antall stressed that the government intends to introduce market relations gradually, and not by means of a "great leap forward." Compromises have to be found between the demands of production efficiency and social guarantees for the population. Hungary will be able to meet its liabilities to foreign creditors only if its annual economic growth rate is three or four percent. The government reckons on achieving such figures by the end of a two-year transition period. Other priority areas: curbing inflation, achieving convertibility of the forint, boosting enterprise and competition, closing down unprofitable production giants, and promoting the structural modernization of the economy, with medium and small enterprises playing a decisive role. In essence, these are the same aims that the previous government strove toward. Will the new cabinet fulfill the task? Many deputies reproached Antall with being excessively optimistic.

The cabinet's intentions in the foreign policy sphere are of particular interest.

"Hungary will pursue an independent foreign policy, based on the priority of national interests," Jozsef Antall declared. "The government would like the withdrawal of Soviet forces from our country's territory to be completed earlier than the agreed time, that is, before 30 June 1991."

Ryzhkov Condolences to Romania on Earthquake

LD0106215890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jun (TASS)—Nikolay Ryzhkov, head of the Soviet Government, has expressed sincere condolences in connection with the earthquake in Romania which resulted in human casualties and material losses, to Petre Roman, prime minister of Romania. He also conveyed profound sympathy to the families of the dead and afflicted.

USSR-Polish Illegal Border Crossings Viewed

LD2905120190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 29 May 90

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] A report from our correspondents on the work of the customs service in new conditions:

[V. Lyashko, identified by screen caption] The sector of the Soviet-Polish border in (Shagino). More than 3 million people cross the state border every year at the crossing for cars. All sorts of things happen here, of course. Recently, in particular, attempts by our compatriots to leave on forged visas or other people's passports have become more frequent. [passage omitted]

The forgery techniques are becoming more and more sophisticated. It is for this reason that the border troops spend so much time studying what this underground business has managed to achieve, and today it really is a profitable occupation. Since the beginning of this year alone, together with the customs service the border troops of the (?oblast) passport control post in Mostiska have captured contraband worth 6 million rubles. [passage omitted] [Video shows people lining up at the crossing point, women officer dealing with them, close-up of documents, border troops at work, confiscated weapons, dog being brushed, German shepherd dog barking behind barbed wire]

West Europe

Ligachev Studies Cooperatives in Stockholm

LD0606175890 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Dmitiry Gorokhov]

[Text] Stockholm June 6 TASS—Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, is studying Sweden's experience in the cooperative movement and its practice of providing social protection for the population.

The Soviet official met with Lars Marcus, president of the International Cooperative Alliance, who described the activity of this international non-governmental organisation grouping more than 500 million cooperators in nearly 100 countries.

They discussed ways of strengthening the Soviet Union's interaction with the international alliance and its branches.

Ligachev visited the headquarters of Sweden's Cooperative Alliance and met with the president of this leading national economic association, Leif Lewin.

During a trip to the city of Gustavsberg, Ligachev familiarised himself with the activity of the local commercial consumer cooperative Domus and talked with its employees.

The role of central and local authorities in improving the quality of life was discussed during a meeting with Social Affairs Minister Ingela Thalen. She described Sweden's social development system, its principles and finances.

In an interview with TASS, Ligachev said that all Swedish officials expressed profound interest in the success of perestroyka and their readiness to cooperate with the USSR.

He described the Swedish cooperative movement as "an undoubtedly major and promising partner" for the Soviet Union.

Ligachev said that he was going to study more thoroughly the mechamism of the state regulation of the market, measures to prevent unemployment and other issues related to the social protection of the population.

He stressed that Sweden has accumulated interesting, diverse experience both in the sphere of cooperation and in social protection. The Soviet Union, he remarked, "should analyse this experience, keeping in mind, of course, differences in the specific conditions in the two countries."

Italy's Andreotti on Gorbachev's U.S. Visit

LD0606223490 Moscow TASS in English 2226 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Teterin]

[Text] Rome June 7 TASS—Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti highly appraised the results of the Soviet-American summit. He said in an interview with TASS, "I think it very important that a good rapport was established between the two presidents and the atmosphere was well-meaning at the talks: Such an atmosphere facilitates the performance of complex and thorough work. As regards the substance of the talks, I believe they were crowned with success. Considerable strides ahead have been taken, agreement on new meetings has been reached. Italy views prospects for further Soviet-American dialogue with optimism."

"I consider the NATO summit scheduled for early July very important. It will discuss vital matters because, according to NATO Secretary-General Woerner, it will deal with new tasks the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation will have to accomplish in Europe under new conditions."

Chairwoman of the Italian Parliament's Chamber of Deputies Leonilde Yotti told TASS "I find such summits of exceptionally great importance. There is not denying the positive nature of the summit during which Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush reached a series of major agreements."

"As I see it, the president of the two countries laid the foundations for continuing their dialogue aiming to make life on our planet more peaceful. One thing is certain: The Soviet-American summit opened up new prospects for disarmament," the Italian parliamentary leader noted.

PRAVDA's Frolov Receives Irish Delegation

PM3105154990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[Unattributed report: "Meetings at the Editorial Office"]

[Text] I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, yesterday received a delegation from The Workers' Party [WP] of Ireland, headed by WP General Secretary S. Garland. The conversation touched on questions concerning the situation in the CPSU and its preparations for its 28th congress, problems of interethnic relations, events in East European countries, and the future of socialism.

The PRAVDA editorial office was visited by D. Palmer, director general of the British paper the FINANCIAL TIMES, and its Moscow correspondent Q. Peel. I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, talked about the paper's role in covering the processes taking place in our country and in the world. There was also a discussion of the prospects for possible cooperation between the two papers.

Political & Social

Shcherbakov: 35-40 Million Jobless Possible

LD0606184890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The last labor exchange in the USSR was closed in a ceremony held 60 years ago in 1930.

[Correspondent A. Verigin, identified by screen caption] Today specialists of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social problems talked of the real possibility of setting up labor exchanges under conditions of the future market economy.

[V.I. Shcherbakov, chairman of the state committee, identified by screen caption] We have prepared this decision and we are insisting upon it. That is to say, we are ready for this from the moral, economic, and psychological point of view, and we consider it the only correct solution.

[Verigin] Today's labor exchanges will be called employment services.

[Shcherbakov] We want to set up an employment service—we want to put all our efforts into this during 1990 in the main—which will have to provide vocational guidance services, vocational training of the population, retraining, enhancement of qualifications, and job placement. And if we do not find a suitable job, then the payment of unemployment benefits.

[Verigin] According to the experts' estimates, unemployment will reach 6-8 million at best, given a smooth changeover to market relations; but given a sharp, shock entry into market relations, it could be 35-40 million people. And under a tense situation of that kind, market relations could be reminiscent of those of the bazaar.

Pavlov Discusses Tax Rates, Rationale

LD0606235390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1825 GMT 6 Jun 90

["Topical Interview" program]

[Text] [Announcer] A few days ago, we broadcast an interview with USSR Minister of Finance Valentin Segeyevich Pavlov. He dealt with some aspects of a problem that is important for all of us—the transition to a market economy. Today we continue the discussion, and this time the topic will be something without which progress toward the market will be impossible—changes in the taxation system. [video shows Pavlov speaking to unidentified correspondent]

[Begin recording] [Pavlov] You know, I'll try and use medical terminology to reply to this question. For the individual, both dystrophy and obesity are harmful. In either case, people end up feeling much worse than they perhaps could or should. Therefore, in this sense, the new law is based on the premise that people on low incomes will now pay less tax than they paid before the introduction of the law.

I must say that we have reduced tax rates for everyone who today receives pay or other income of up to 150 rubles [R] per month. For them, all tax rates have gone down—in different proportions, but they have gone down all the same. The level of income below which no tax at all is paid has been raised to R100. And between R100 and R150, the rate has gone down. From R150 to R700, the tax rate has remained unchanged. This means that for this group of the population, we have either reduced the burden of taxation or, at any rate, kept it where it was. Thus, we have created something which could be called protection against dystrophy.

As for the other side of the coin, where income exceeds R700 per month today, we have indeed increased the tax burden. But please note one figure. The sum of taxation for earnings of up to R1,000 has basically gone up by two rubles. I think that given these figures, we can scarcely say that we have given anyone cause for any very serious complaint. But the main burden of taxation has started to go up above an earning level of over R1,500 per month. Even then, we apply the new tax rates not to the R1,500, but only that amount which is above R700. Up to R700, we don't touch it either.

I must tell you frankly that taxes have gone up most of all for those who earn more than R3,000 per month. There, we really did use to take 13 percent from earnings in excess of R3,000, and now we take 60 percent. You can work out for yourself whether this is fair or not, given our present-day standard of living and the correlation between productivity and pay. We thought that basically R3,000 was a sufficiently high price to be put on any contribution, be it physical, intellectual, or whatever you like. And 40 percent of anything left on top of R3,000 is by and large a sufficiently effective incentive for people not to stop at R3,000. I'll cite one last figure. The tax increase of all kinds, even those of just three kopecks, has affected just 1.5 million working people out of 130 million. There's your answer regarding personal taxation.

As far as taxation of enterprises is concerned, this is a very controversial matter, from two points of view above all. Should statewide tax rates be fixed up above, that is by the USSR Supreme Soviet, or should they be entrusted to the republics or regions? We believe that every body of soviet power should deal with the functions placed on it under our Constitution and by our legislation. It must deal with them on an appropriate financial basis. We must not have the dependence that we have all criticized on the grounds of the absence of rights of the local soviets: We want a territory to develop and people to look after their environment, but without at the same time possessing financial resources there. But exactly the same question arises over the republics. If we want to have a health service, certain employment guarantees, if we want roads, we cannot, for instance, build a

Moscow-Simferopol highway on a piecemeal basis. We would never get a road that way: we'd be completing it in one place and starting to repair it again in another. And that, by the way, is what actually happens rather often.

[Correspondent] How can we work better?

[Pavlov] Every level must have its firm source of revenue, and it must be fixed and be genuinely independent both of the top and the bottom. Exactly the same goes for the all-union government. If we confer certain obligations on it—in this case, minimal guarantees covering social protection: such things as pensions, allowances, and education—it does not signify that the republic, kray oblast, or rayon cannot supplement this legislation, but there must be minimum guarantees. We can't say today that if a retiree worked in Krasnoyarsk, but moves to Sochi to live, his pension will not be paid there and he must get it from Krasnoyarsk! There must be some kind of minimum social guarantee. Take the army—it must be maintained by the whole country. The same goes for the diplomatic service. I'd like to give the example of the railways: No single oblast or kray could cope.

Then you have to bear in mind that the things connected with the whole country can be very little connected with the interests of a particular specific territory today or even tomorrow. Who can tell you from the regions today how, for instance, the creation of a major conurbation in Nakhodka would affect the supply of Irkutsk or Krasnoyarsk and their economic dealings? How can this be defined? In what degree is Irkutsk prepared to participate? This is only possible on the level of programs.

We have proposed that a federal tax rate—that is, the all-union part—and a republican tax rate be fixed for one simple reason. We are very much afraid of local taxsetting appearing in an enormous country like ours, with such great ethnic, environmental, and all sorts of other differences. Why is this? It is because when we speak of the market and producers, we must in this instance proceed on the basis that we must also give them some sort of protection in the economic sense throughout the country, so that we don't get a situation in which on a particular territory someone is being strangled with taxes. There must be an upper tax limit for everyone, including for the local tax rate. If you want a lower level to encourage a particular production plant, go ahead! You can take off tax altogether out of your own resources, if you like! But you must not go above this level. This is because we already have a large number of examples today of plants being closed for one reason or another. If we also make it possible for enterprises to be taxed according to the region they find themselves in, either we're going to have a very large amount of unpleasantness, or we shall create yet another basis for all kinds of corruption, and, to put it plainly, for bribery. We wouldn't like to create this sort of additional lack of social protection or....

[Correspondent, interrupting] Or tension....

[Pavlov] ...Or tension. So for this reason, we are saying that we'd like to fix the upper tax limits both for the union and the republics, and beyond that a system of privileges and preferences should operate. [end recording]

Committee Refutes 'Radiactive Cloud' Story

PM0606201590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 p 1

["Own Information" report: "Freak Weather"]

[Text] In view of reports by some Western media about a radioactive cloud detected by Finland, the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial office contacted the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology at 2040 hours yesterday. According to USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology (Murmansk Administration) statistics, radiation levels at the administration's stations did not exceed normal background readings at the time the request was made.

The KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial office contacted representatives of Japanese media in Moscow. Apparently, yesterday morning a Dutch meteorological center detected a large cloud above Murmansk Oblast. Hypotheses about its radiocative origin were not confirmed. It was an ordinary cloud. The Dutch meteorological center's information was refuted.

KYODO: Some Siberian Air Routes Closed

OW0606111590 Tokyo KYODO in English 1103 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Tokyo, June 6 KYODO—The Soviet Union closed some of the air routes over Siberia Wednesday afternoon, delaying six international flights between Tokyo and Europe via Siberia for up to two hours, Transport Ministry officials said.

Soviet air controllers have informed Japan that seven out of 11 air routes over Siberia are to be closed between 2:20 P.M. and 1:35 A.M. on Thursday (Japan Time).

The Soviet controllers attributed the restrictions only to "technical reasons," officials said.

A Paris-bound Air France flight left Tokyo two hours behind schedule, while a British Airways flight changed its course to fly via Anchorage, Alaska, officials said.

Government Presidium Debates Press, Customs Code

PM0506100390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report from USSR Council of Ministers by V. Romanyuk: "Should Government Be Deciding Everything?"]

[Text] At a session on Wednesday 30 May 1990 the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium examined, among other things, two questions which, it seems to me, are of special public interest.

We complain about the mail: The evening paper arrives in the morning, the next issue of a journal is delayed by several months. Something is amiss in our glasnost mechanism. Unrestricted subscription has increased the print runs of popular publications, while paper stocks remain the same, printing facilities remain obsolete, and mail services and transport are making losses.

B. Kuzmin, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Press, reported on this matter. Noting that it was a question with a strong political flavor, he named several possible solutions to the problems. First and foremost, he called for an increase in the cost of a single copy of a newspaper or journal. Here are the arguments: With the increase in wholesale prices, periodicals will lose 233 million rubles [R] per year instead of making profits of R826 million. The current USSR Ministry of Communications delivery rates must be revised—so that the mail ceases to make a loss. Finally, it was proposed that subscriptions should run not from 1 August, as usual, but from 1 September 1990.

This package of proposals produced conflicting opinions and many questions. For example, by how much do you raise the cover price to obtain the desired profit, without losing readers? And who takes the decision to raise the subscription rate? After all, the one who makes this decision is bound to be categorized by public opinion as an opponent of glasnost—this has to be taken into account these days.

There were other views: Determine the priorities that can be defended by the state (children's periodicals, major political publications, cultural and educational publications); alter the subscription and retail sales ratio.

The government has stopped issuing directive guidelines and it is not going to take upon itself decisions that are clearly unpopular. USSR Council of Ministers First Deputy Chairman L. Voronin, who chaired the session, said that the government would not agree to change subscription dates. The proposal on reducing the frequency of the publication of newspapers was similarly rejected. As for the prices of publications, the publishing houses were to told to set their own—taking into account the market situation and priorities that can be set in conjunction with the government.

The draft USSR customs code has taken four years to devise. There it was on the table, the heavy folio volume. The intensive development of foreign economic activity demands the speediest introduction of this regulatory document. The draft contains a number of innovations. The fact that it acts directly is extremely important, because this rules out any departmental norm creation. The draft makes it possible to subscribe to international conventions and become an integral part of the world market and it creates the possibility of the adoption of a law on special economic zones. Mention was also made of the fact that no republic objects to the creation of a single customs administration and the functioning of a single customs service on the territory of the USSR. Incidentally, unified customs statistics are being introduced for the first time.

It was thought necessary to clarify the procedure for levying charges and duties. The question of applying duties to our exports was raised. Since we are switching to civilized forms of foreign economic activity, customs control cannot be left out of the picture.

Yakovlev Chairs Commission on Repressions

LD0506210790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Under the chairmanship of Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, a routine sitting has been held of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission on the additional study of the materials connected with the repressions of the thirties, forties and the start of the fifties and the results of the work of the commission done since the moment of its inception, that is September 1987. It was noted that the process of rehabilitation of the victims of repressions interrupted in the mid-sixties has been revived in practice and accelerated to the necessary extent. [passage omitted]

A particular place in the activities of the commission went to additional study of the materials on the major political trials. They were all, as has been established, the result of arbitrariness and glaring violations of legality.

A complete report on the work of the commission will be published in the press.

Yazov Awards Prizes to Authors

LD0406152390 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—USSR Defence Minister, Marshal Dmitriy Yazov today presented prizes and diplomas of the USSR Defence Ministry to a number of Soviet writers. Among those who received these awards for the contribution to the coverage of the life of the Soviet armed forces are writers and publicists Oleg Kirillov, Ivan Lazutin, Aleksandr Shchelokov, Yuriy Teplov, and a number of other prose writers and poets.

"The presentation of awards of the USSR Defence Ministry to authors in the present complex atmosphere,

an atmosphere of transition, assumes special importance," Yazov said in an interview to TASS. He said these awards were given to authors whose works oppose the attempts to shaken attitudes of the Soviet people to defence, assert patriotism, loyalty to the duty of a soldier, love for the motherland and readiness to protect it.

Yazov said that readers are attracted by books about the army that honestly show the life of the military. "They show life as it is, but without painting it in dark colours which has become characteristic of a number of publications lately," the minister said.

Everybody in the Soviet Union who treasures the honour of a soldier, protector of the motherland, highly appreciates such works, Yazov said.

Medvedev Attends Cinematographers Union Congress

PM0606134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Cinematogaphers' Forum"]

[Text] There is hardly any point in denying the truth of the saying that the cinema reflects life.. That is why the changes taking place in our lives have not bypassed the cinema and are being portrayed on the screen. Pressing contradictions, the reasons for which lie not so much in the development of Soviet movie art as in present-day realities, made it necessary to hold the routine Sixth Congress of USSR Cinematographers a year earlier than planned. It began its work in Moscow 5 June.

Opening the congress, E.G. Klimov, first secretary of the USSR Cinematographers Union Board, read out a CPSU Central Committee greeting to the delegates and guests of the cinematographic forum and read out the agenda.

We are not inclined to describe our congress as an emergency one—it is an ordinary, working forum—A.S Smirnov, one of the creative union's leaders, pointed out, delivering the report from the board secretariat. We are entitled to meet once every five years according to the existing statutes. A sociological survey among members of the Cinematographers Union revealed the need for and the timeliness of the current meeting.

Although only four years have elapsed since the previous fifth congress, the keynote speaker had plenty to talk about. The creation of a conflict commission was one of the most significant results. After inspecting 250 pictures, it removed 207 movies from the notorious "shelf," restoring them to the viewers. The appearance of new studios and the emergence of formations that did not previously exist such as a movie center, a movie foundation, a central movie museum, and professional guilds were also described as positive results of the activity of the USSR Cinematographers Union.

E.G. Klimov, who delivered the coreport, invited the gathering to ponder the immediate future. Voicing concern at the threat of the total commercialization of Soviet cinema, he suggested one way out of the incipient conflict—the creation of a state foundation for cinematographic development.

Reports were heard regarding the work of the union's auditing commission and the creative association's new draft statute. Then A.I. Kamshalov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, was given the floor.

V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretary, took part in the congress' work.

Vlasov, Others Mark Centennial of Chuvash Poet

PM0606121590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "Classic of Chuvash Poetry"]

[Excerpts] UNESCO has decided that the centennial of the birth of Konstantin Ivanov, a classic author of Chuvash literature, should be one of the dates entered on the calendar marking the anniversaries of outstanding men and historical events. A ceremonial soiree 5 June in Moscow in the House of the Union's Hall of Columns was devoted to the jubilee of the author of the immortal poem "Narspi." [passage omitted]

The soiree was attended by A.V. Vlasov, Yu.A. Manayenkov, and G.I. Usmanov.

Obituary of Former Leader V.V. Kuznetsov

PM0706115190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

[Obituary of Vasiliy Vasilyevich Kuznetsov]

[Excerpts] Vasiliy Vasilyevich Kuznetsov, individual union pensioner, former first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, one of the oldest CPSU members, and an eminent Soviet diplomat, died 5 June 1990 in his 90th year. [Passage omitted]

V.V. Kuznetsov was noted for exceptional diligence and a conscientious attitude toward work, high professionalism and principle, exactingness toward himself and others, and a solicitous attitude to people. These qualities rightly earned V.V. Kuznetsov the profound respect of all who knew him and worked with him.

The bright memory of Vasiliy Vasilyevich Kuznetsov will remain forever in our hearts.

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N. Zaykov, V.A. Ivashko, V.A. Kryuchkov, Ye.K. Ligachev, Yu.D. Maslyukov, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.P.

Biryukova, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, Ye.M. Primakov, B.K. Pugo, G.P. Razumovskiy, D.T. Yazov, O.D. Baklanov, A.N. Girenko, Yu.A. Manayenkov, Ye.S. Stroyev, G.I. Usmanov, I.T. Frolov, I.D. Laptev, R.N. Nishanov, G.I. Yanayev, N.F. Rubtsov, M.S. Shkabardnya, S.V. Kolpakov, A.G. Kovalev.

Laptev Views Gorbachev-Yeltsin Relationship

AU0606164190 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 6 Jun 90 p 1

[Peter Schmalz report: "Yeltsin and Gorbachev Pursue Same Goals"]

[Text] Moscow—Does Boris Yeltsin really represent a danger to Mikhail Gorbachev? Ivan Laptev, a former chief editor of the IZVESTIYA government newspaper and present chairman of the USSR Presidential Council and as such one of the highest ranking politicians, raises a warning finger. "Do not describe Boris Yeltsin as an opponent of President Gorbachev," says the 55-year-old Laptev, answering a relevant question of DIE WELT. "He is by no means an opponent of Mikhail Gorbachev. Both are proponents of the same goal—perestroyka. While they may differ over the tactics, they pursue the same strategic goal."

Laptev does not attach major importance to Yeltsin's critical statements on the Soviet president. "You know how politicians talk sometimes when they have not yet reached their goal." From the window, he points to the Kremlin Palace where the blue and red flag of the RSFSR is flying, and where Yeltsin has been chairing the Russian National Congress as president for days. Once this congress has resolved the personnel problems and is dealing with factual issues, "much will return to normal," says Laptev.

However, Laptev will see what normalcy means in the Soviet Union, when the Supreme Soviet is meeting to discuss the future economic law. Before that, he unexpectedly meets the group of Bundeswehr soldiers who have toured the Soviet Union for 10 days. He receives the guests, saying "your visit is a historic moment." "You are the first German soldiers in this office room. And you are dear guests. That is the first higher step to our joint relations."

Laptev addresses the problems frankly. "Regarding the economic issues, a decisive step will be made in perestroyka. High expectations had been raised, and many people thought that four or five new laws would have to be made, and that we would approach the new times in goose-step. Gorbachev was viewed as a miracle healer. Now many people are concerned about the future." However, he speaks about the "substantial determination" to push perestroyka. "We cannot continue our way of life." The military, too, are facing major changes. He says that he can conceive of a civilian defense minister and a regular army, which would, however, entail considerable financial burdens. "Our military expenses are not high, but they would rise substantially if we had regular troops."

Laptev says in the DIE WELT interview that the German unification process "is based on the will of the German people in East and West. We wish them much success in implementing this process." The fast speed of events shows "that there was a large stream of pent-up emotions that could not be stopped." However, we must not forget that these current changes are developing within "certain realities" which they must not destroy. Ivan Laptev also warns about ignoring the aspects of security and psychology, quoting Gorbachev to the effect that it helps no one that the neighbor's security is smaller than one's own security.

He urgently calls upon his German visitors to help his country solve its present "grandiose problems." He says that "to us, every kind of sympathy and moral support is important. We are already getting tangible support from the Federal Republic, and our relations are developing very, very well."

Economic

CPSU Plenum May Discuss New Economic Plan

LD0706101190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From "Soviet Chronicle" feature of "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] As has become known to an INTERFAX correspondent, there will be a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on 9 or 10 June. Preparations for the 28th [party] congress will be discussed. As reported to the correspondent by circles close to the Central Committee, one should also not exclude the fact that the plenum will discuss a reworked variant of the government program for a transfer to market conditions of management.

Albalkin on Importance of Market Reform

LD0606172890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] In the State Committee for Labor and Social Questions in Moscow today, there was a press conference on the changeover to market relations and the social protection of the working people.

Market relations, subsidies, unemployment, price increases—these words are now on the lips of millions of Soviet people. But changes in the structure of the economy are most worrying to the least well-provided-for strata of the population: pensioners, invalids, large families, and young people. How can the state ensure a normal standard of living for them and help in resolving those difficulties which are inevitable in establishing the market?

As is known, the government has proposed its program for changing over to the market. But there are the most contradictory attitudes to this. As yet, perhaps, negative assessments predominate. So, is this a dead-end or is there still a way out? This is how the situation which has arisen is assessed by one of the program's authors, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, with whom our correspondent Valeriy Kiosa met. Listen to this recording:

[Abalkin] We are on the threshold of radical changes in our economic system, in the whole mechanism of running the national economy. One of the decisive conditions for success is to restructure the social consciousness of the management cadres and perhaps, in the first instance, even more importantly of those who bear this knowledge. We must build, as it were, a pyramid from the top down when, by elaborating a general concept of the political program and a specific economic mechanism, we must first teach this to hundreds of people and, through them, restructure the whole system of teaching and retraining cadres in the localities and from there to the enterprises. According to our estimates, at management level alone in the forthcoming half year tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands of management specialists must undergo such a rethinking and mastering of the new mechanism.

[Kiosa] In your speeches both before the government report and after it, you have frequently stressed the need for national accord for our country to successfully get out of the very complicated situation it is now in. But, unfortunately, no national accord is yet to be seen. The government report has aroused the most contradictory assessments, both among specialists and the population.

[Abalkin] The most important thing is to tell the truth, to display honesty in setting out one's plans and intentions and the expected consequences. There is no alternative for achieving national accord. Attempts to alleviate the initial difficulties and painful phenomena would be a delusion and would mean the final and total loss of trust in the government program. The government program can be criticized from various aspects. It is not ideal. It needs improvement. That is obvious. It is difficult to imagine how, even by bringing in the best forces, a document of such scale, depth, and breadth of embrace of the problems, could be elaborated so quickly.

But there is one thing, evidently, that the program cannot be reproached for: attempting to smooth over the difficulties and play down the possible consequences. We have been reproached for overemphasizing the negative phenomena and told we should have painted an attractive picture of the market. But in the past we many times have burnt our fingers with such actions, with excessive illusions. Perhaps we have focused attention on the difficulties but I repeat, in general, reproaches can be made, justly or unjustly, but the government cannot be reproached for trying to cover up and hide, to refuse to engage in direct discussion with the people. This direct discussion with the people is not something which is being imposed on us by someone else. We understand the risk of this step, the danger of lack of support. But we, ourselves, proposed this.

If we do not have such strong support, such credit of trust behind us, it is impossible to carry out the reform. Either this should be done by others who will receive such support—but this is unlikely at present; it is unlikely that any other group or force is at present capable, all at once and unexpectedly, of receiving overall support—or else we postpone indefinitely the radical reform and the situation will get worse month by month and the subsequent cost of the transfer will be even higher. [end recording]

Yarin: Market Reforms Implementation Impossible

LD0606113690 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From "Soviet Chronicle" feature of "Soviet Union Day by Day" program; report attributed to INTERFAX]

[Text] In connection with the fact the leaders of the three republics—the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, and Belorussia—have come out against the government's concept for a transition to the market system, implementation of this concept is impossible, even if the USSR Supreme Soviet adopts it. Veniamin Yarin, a member of the USSR Presidential Council, said this at a news conference in Moscow. He spoke in favor of leading at a conference table figures from those republics and the Soviet Union finding a way out of the situation that has arisen, before discussion of the program is continued in the parliament.

AUCCTU Chief Urges Social Protection Measures

LD0606091490 Moscow TASS in English 0856 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS—The transition to a regulated market in the Soviet Union should be preceded by a countrywide referendum. Launching a radical restructuring of the economy, which will inevitably involve many difficulties, the government must win the consent of the public at large and make sure people are prepared to make this difficult but necessary choice.

Such opinions are being expressed by participants in meetings and conferences of sectoral and regional trade unions currently being held all over the country to discuss the government plan for the introduction of market relations.

Soviet trade union leaders do not rule out the possibility that the majority will vote against a market during the referendum.

In that case, large-scale discussions and roundtable meetings will have to be held involving the government, trade unions and representatives of various social movements,

Gennadiy Yanayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions (AUCCTU), believes.

"It is now paramount to convince people that the transition to market relations is the only chance to prevent further degradation of the country's economy," he told TASS.

At the same time trade unions believe that the Soviet parliament, prior to the transition, should work out and adopt a programme for the social protection of the population, primarily low-income groups (pensioners, veterans, the disabled, large families, students, and orphans).

For its part, the AUCCTU suggested a bill to index the population's incomes, envisaging their automatic adjustment in keeping with the growth of the cost of living.

Considering that unemployment in the Soviet Union, primarily in the areas of Central Asia and Transcaucasia, has become an indisputable fact and that market relations may increase it three to four times over, the AUCCTU prepared a bill on employment and referred it to the government.

The bill guarantees jobs to all those who are capable of and want to work and envisages a procedure for retraining the labour force and reorienting its uses.

Trade unions are suggesting that unemployment benefits should be introduced during the radical restructuring of the economic mechanism.

Yanayev and other AUCCTU leaders (their viewpoint was supported by many primary organisations) consider it necessary to conclude a general annual agreement on social matters. Such an agreement could become the basis of a mechanism for cooperation between trade and the government.

Independent TU Council Disagrees on Market Switch

LD3105095190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] The presidium of the Council of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia has made a statement expressing disagreement with the option for switching to a market economy proposed by the government. Willingness is expressed for constructive dialogue between the trade unions and the government and for a joint search for ways out of the crisis.

Trade Unions Respond to Market Proposals

WA0606191290 Moscow TRUD in Russian 31 May 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "AUCCTU: Clear Position"]

[Text] A conference of representatives of the Central Committee of industrial trade unions was held in the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] on 29 May at which information was presented by G.I Yanayev, AUCCTU chairman, concerning the country's switch to regulated market relations and a change in price formation.

During the discussions, conference participants, understanding the need for conducting economic reforms, turned their attention to the impermissibility of "shock therapy" and the advisability of a phased introduction of market mechanisms.

At the same time, assessing the situation objectively and fully understanding the alarm of Soviet citizens, the trade unions appealed to the Government of the USSR to tell the people honestly and frankly the intent of introducing market relationships, why the country must take this step, what we can expect in the near future, what prospect awaits us, how long social instability will last, and when we will realistically achieve tangible results from the measures that have been undertaken. Everyone must express his attitude on the proposed program through a referendum whose conduct is not in doubt.

Accusations against trade unions of populism, retrogression, flexing of political "muscles," and opposition to the realities of measures that have been taken can be heard in the mass media and in the speeches of individual scholars and journalists. In this connection, it was emphasized at the conference, the necessity of the position of the trade unions is prompted by an understanding of the complexity of the current situation and responsibility for the sharp turn in economic policy, whose failure will bring consequences that are not predictable. It is precisely for this reason that there is such a need for sound judgment and a thorough consideration of opinions before a final step is taken.

The trade unions believe that the USSR Supreme Soviet, with the participation of the workers, must develop and adopt a program of social protection for the population and primarily for those who are poorly provided for (pensioners, veterans, invalids, large families, youth, students, orphans, and other categories of citizens). Consideration must be given once again to the necessity for and the validity of introducing a reform of price formation and the periods of its implementation. In this connection, it is necessary in a timely way to provide for an appropriate system of indexation of incomes of the population and reliable compensation that would correspond to increased prices. We should now adopt the Law on Employment and create job guarantees for everyone who can and wants to work and provide a procedure for retraining the work force and reorienting its utilization.

As was remarked at the conference, the trade unions state their constructive position on these questions in draft laws developed by the AUCCTU concerning employment and the indexation of the incomes of the population.

In the opinion of conference participants, there is a pressing need for the elaboration and completion of a general agreement on social questions which could

become the main mechanism of cooperation of the trade unions and the government.

Odessa Plant Output Affected by Poor Deliveries

LD0506135190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The changeover to the market economy is attracting an increasing number of supporters. The report that we are about to show confirms yet again that the real market is not that far away, but there are many difficulties on the way.

[Correspondent K. Kharlamov—identified by caption] This plant produces equipment for all kinds of construction sites... or rather, does not produce it. The warehouse is packed to the limit with equipment. Soon there will be no room anywhere on the premises.

This is caused by incomplete components. This situation has come about thanks, as it were, to poor deliveries from associate enterprises of the Odessa machine-building plant—the Balkaria, Nikobolskiy, and Kama plants. The Amaznyy-Sever plant prevents normal work being carried out on the (?Trug) engines.

The Odessa plant produces this equipment to satisfy demand not only in this country but also abroad. Customers in the FRG, the United States, Canada, and Japan buy these products for millions of dollars annually. So if there are no products, there are no orders and no foreign currency. The plant director explains the conditions of the changeover to a market economy:

[Plant Director B. Lobashov—identified by caption] You know what the position is; if I can give you an example—the free economy, the market, the free economy is a different kind of territory. The point is that is not regulated.

The position is that the control figures relate to our productivity; they impose the plan for next year, or the last year, or for 1990, or for 1991, while the material resources such as the equipment that we produce in the current year also have their documentation. So we have to get involved in those questions.

In addition, the entire plant is working at half capacity. And that is the position regarding the equipment we supply to the USSR. But obviously we are producing output.

And whenever we go anywhere they talk about the next delivery batches. They ask us questions; material funds are affected, vacation trips are affected, growth is affected, foreign currency is affected.

It is correct to say that no enterprise can tolerate such conditions. [end recording] [video shows interior of plant and products]

Gold Miners Fear Market, Seek New Terms

PM0606145390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 24 May 90

[From "Vremya" Newscast: A. Bardo, N. Osipov, identified by caption, reportage on problems at "Baleyzoloto" gold mining and enrichment combine]

[Text] [Newscaster] I would have never believed that people handling gold, or rather mining gold, the hardest currency there is, could be afraid of the market. Nonetheless, our gold miners are afraid of the market, and not just a little.

[Correspondent] This is "Baleyzoloto," one of Siberia's major gold mining and enrichment combines. [video shows various aspects of a vast open-cut mine and other industrial installations] At this enterprise, which was at one time considered to be the country's foreign currency production shop and dealt in sums of money running into millions, they are finding it hard to find a few thousand rubles to repair the school and buy furniture for the kindergarten, not to mention pay for housing construction or land recultivation.

[P.K. Glazunov, mining engineer and secretary of the combine's party committee, identified by caption, facing camera] We think with horror about what is in store for the combine in connection with the switch to a market economy.

[Correspondent] Why horror?

[Glazunov] How are we going to settle accounts with our suppliers? After all, apart from the gold we have nothing.

[Correspondent] And the gold belongs to the state?

[Glazunov] Yes, we hand all the gold over to the state.

[Correspondent] Nonetheless, even given this state of affairs it would be possible to manage, provided that the payments into the state budget and to superior organizations and the cost of fixed assets, labor resources, and many other things did not total 52 percent of the profit.

[V.N. Baranov, director of "Baleyzoloto" combine, identified by caption, facing camera] I believe that, unless the system for the mutual settling of accounts with the miners is changed, nothing much will change here. What we need is a fixed price and payments at international prices, at least for the metal extracted above the plan.

[Correspondent] And then?

[Baranov] Then we will be able to decide ourselves how to spend the money and draw up the program for our development and increased gold production.

[Correspondent] Then there will be enough to go round, both for the state and yourselves?

[Baranov] That is what I think. Then everyone will be satisfied.

[Correspondent] Meanwhile, mining gold in this way [video shows women in white coats handling gold and doing clerical work], people are unable to achieve better living conditions. It brings them poverty rather than riches. [video shows poor housing]

Ministry Plans To Export Planes, Helicopters

LD0506145290 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpt] The Soviet Aircraft-Building Ministry will seek to earn foreign currency by exporting planes and helicopters. This has been announced by the minister of the industry, Apollon Systsov. The industry will also set up joint venture with foreign companies to design new aviation technologies. [passage omitted]

Agricultural

Ligachev Chairs CPSU Agrarian Commission

LD0506110390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Under the chairmanship of Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev, member of the Poilitburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Issues of Agrarian Policies discussed a number of topical problems in the development of the country's agroindustrial complex. Measures to maintain the parity of prices on industrial and agricultural products were considered. The reasonableness of the demands made by collective and state farms and processing enterprises about the need to strictly maintin the parity of prices, which is presently being violated on a mass scale, was noted. During the past year prices were raised by between 1.5 and 10 times on 25 types of new machinery. Thus, such an important economic lever for solving the foodstuffs problem in the country as the mechanism for maintaining the parity of prices between industry and agriculture has in practical terms not been used. To increase the commitment of machine builders, the commission considers it expedient to plan on allocating state subsidies and preferential credits for them for the period during which new machinery is assimilated.

TASS Report

LD0506131190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jun (TASS)—Under the chairmanship of Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Issues of Agrarian Policy has discussed several topical problems of the development of the country's agroindustrial complex. Measures to maintain the parity of prices for industrial and agricultural produce were examined and reports were heard from communist leaders of the USSR Ministry of Heavy Machine Building and the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry and Instrument Making on fulfilling government decisions on providing refrigeration equipment for agroindustrial production, as was information on progress in elaborating a plan for the socioeconomic development of the agroindustrial complex in 1991.

Reviewing the results, Ye. Ligachev stressed the great significance of the issues under examination to the implementation of agrarian policy and resolving the food problem in the country. The important economic lever of the mechanism for maintaining parity of prices between industry and agriculture has been virtually inoperative and remains imperfect. The groundless raising of prices for machinery, equipment, and materials supplied to the agroindustrial complex leads to considerable financial resources being removed from agriculture and sharply reduces the capacity of the agroindustrial complex for the production and social development of collective and state farms and processing enterprises. This makes mutual relations between towns and rural areas complex.

The fate of food supplies, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed, is directly dependent on the creation of a reliable base for storing and processing agricultural produce. If the country had all that it needs to supply the consumer with the fruits of the harvest without wastage then the picture as regards the food supply to the country's population would be completely different.

As familty farms, leaseholding collectives, and peasant farms have developed in the countryside there has been a sharp increase in the need for cheap small production equipment. Machine builders must react quickly to the growing needs of production and do all that is necessary to meet them.

PRAVDA Account

PM0606125190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Sitting of CPSU Central Committee Commission on Questions of Agrarian Policy"]

[Text] Under the chairmanship of Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Questions of Agrarian Policy discussed a number of topical problems of the development of the country's agroindustrial complex.

It examined measures to maintain parity of prices for industrial and agricultural output and heard reports from the communists and leaders of the USSR Ministry of Heavy Machine Building and the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry and Instrument Making on the fulfillment of government decisions on providing agricultural production with refrigeration equipment and also an information report on the

progress in elaborating the plan for the agroindustrial complex' development for 1991.

V.I. Chernoivanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases; V.K. Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices; CPSU Central Committee Secretary Ye.S. Stroyev; commission members I.G. Grintsov and Ye.Ye. Sokolov; G.V. Kolbin, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee; N.G. Belov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics; and USSR Ministers O.N. Shishkin and B.M. Belousov spoke on the first question. The speeches noted that the state of affairs locally attests to the justified nature of the demands made by kolkhozes [collective farms], sovkhozes [state farms], and processing enterprises regarding the need for the strict observance of prices parity. Many ministries and enterprises, using their monopoly position, have recently embarked on the path of massively increasing the cost of machinery and equipment delivered to the agroindustrial complex. The defense sectors are increasing prices for equipment for processing industry enterprises particularly heavily. Last year, for instance, prices were raised 50 to 800 percent for 25 types of new equipment.

The violation of prices parity which has been allowed in recent years and which has been increasing recently is drastically worsening the already complex economic position of the production collectives of the agroindustrial complex, primarily the weak facilities, and the rural workers' social protection. Credit debts in relation to fixed capital are nine times higher in agriculture than in other sectors; wages for agricultural workers are nearly 20 percent lower than in the city and social services per capita are 100 percent lower.

The situation is further aggravated by the fact that alongside the violation of prices parity the agroindustrial complex' provision with material and technical resources continue to deteriorate. Last year the needs of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises for tractors, for instance, were met by only 75 percent, their needs for general purpose tractor plows by only 63 percent, their needs for trucks by 58 percent, and their needs for feed harvesting combines and balers were met by only 56 percent. The processing sectors went short of 4,00 items of equipment of 22 types in the first two years of the present five-year plan. The fulfillment of the demands of the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) Plenum and the decisions of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies regarding the priority development of the country's agroindustrial complex is not being ensured this year either.

Within their control procedure the Central Committee commission examined the question of the work of the USSR ministries of heavy machine building and the electrical equipment industry and instrument making on the production of refrigeration equipment. During the discussion of this question USSR Ministers V.M. Velichko and O.G. Anfimov delivered reports.

Commission members A.F. Ponomarev and M.B. Ryzhikov and other participants in the sitting noted that these ministries are failing to ensure the fulfillment of the set targets. It was suggested that they take additional measures which would ensure the consolidation of the machine building base, the production of new equipment complying with world standards, and the solution of social questions in the labor collectives.

The attention of the leaders of the State Planning Committee, the State Committee for Material and Technical Supplies, the State Committee for Construction, the USSR Ministry of Finance, and the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission on Food and Purchases to the need to step up control and organizational work to create a modern refrigeration machine building industry in the country and to create a complete range of electric motors in accordance with the requirements of the economy's agro-industrial sphere.

B.M. Volodin, a member of the commission and first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, provided information on the progress in elaborating the draft plan for the socioeconomic development of the country's agroindustrial complex for 1991.

Summing up the results, Ye.K. Ligachev stressed the great importance of the questions examined for the implementation of agrarian policy and the solution of the food problem in the country. An important economic lever like the mechanism for maintaining parity of prices between industry and agriculture has not been put into operation in practice and remains imperfect. The unfounded increase in prices for equipment, instruments, and materials delivered to the agroindustrial complex is leading to the extraction of substantial monetary funds from agriculture and is drastically reducing the agroindustrial complex' potential for the production and social development of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and processing enterprises. This complicates mutual relations between the city and the countryside.

The USSR Council of Ministers State Commission on Food and Purchases should head work to improve the mechanism which ensures the steady maintenance of parity of prices and which promotes an increase in the output and an improvement in the quality of agricultural machinery, especially equipment for the processing enterprises.

The fate of food supplies, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed, depends directly on the creation of a reliable base for storing and processing agricultural output. If the country had everything necessary to supply the consumer with the fruit of the harvest without losses, then the food supply picture for the country's population would be absolutely different.

With the development of family smallholdings [podvorya] lessee collectives, and labor peasant farms in the countryside there has been a sharp increase in the demand for productive and inexpensive small-scale

equipment. Machine builders must react sensitively to the growing production demands and do everything necessary to satisfy them.

With a view to increasing the machine building enterprises' interest in producing highly efficient machinery and equipment for the agroindustrial complex it would be expedient to provide for the earmaring of state subsidies and preferential credits for them for the period of the development of new equipment.

Great demands have also been made on the communists responsible for organizing the production of refrigeration equipment.

Problems of equivalent exchange between agriculture and industry and the further development of the agricultural raw material processing sphere should be given broader coverage in the mass media. And the work of the communists of the central economic departments and machine building ministries on these questions must be put under the effective control of the party committees.

Advantages of Land Sale Argued

PM0606095390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by E. Gonzalyez under rubric "On Topics of Day": "Land, Commodity, Market"]

[Text] Whenever I am traveling in a suburban electric train I marvel at the kitchen gardens along the road. Tiny plots of land of inconceivable shapes fenced in in the most unexpected ways and indefatigable seminaked gardeners with choppers or rakes. Why do they spend the whole day bowing to their future potatoes? After all, potatoes cost only kopeks in the store. Is it worth all the stooping?

But here are the figures of the USSR State Committee for Statistics: Some 17 percent of urban families engage in horticulture and kitchen gardening. On average each family has 0.06 of a hectare. Over half the land (and in kitchen gardens 90 percent) is sown to potatoes. Some 33 million people meet their own requirements for potatoes in full.

And now let's turn to policy: first to economic policy and finally to ordinary political policy. We would like to put the economy on market terms but we will never decide where the market begins.

I remember how three years ago I was quite unable to understand why the economic reform begins with cost recovery, self-financing and in general with economic accountability. Only now have we had the sense to realize that first it would be worth putting prices in order—without that economic accountability will turn out badly. So we are discussing whether or not to raise prices and whether or not to keep them under control or turn them loose. I fear that another two years or so will pass and we will finally talk about the very first thing—money. After all, neither economic accountability nor prices have any practical point if there is no money. In our country rubles have long been circulating in numerous copies while the originals have disappeared in cashless accounting.

Let's also discuss the market on the same philistine level. A person would not think of going to the market if he has no money or no goods. It seems that we have neither (blooming mills and slab rolling mills do not count—they can be bought in noncash transactions, at least in theory). What are we to do on the market? They suggest selling apartments and sharply increasing prices for gold, caviar, and cured fillet of sturgeon while automobiles will only be sold at auctions....

And what will this selling off to the state and society provide? It will give the state copies of rubles which it could perfectly well simply print and it will give society nothing at all. Alas, we shall not become richer through selling ourselves the same commodity at a higher price.

So do we have anything in excess? In my opinion we do. Look at a map or globe—after all, we do indeed have one-sixth of dry land. Land! It is in this that we are still rich and this which can make us richer. Endless disputes are now under way about whether to give the land to the peasants or to invest new billions in it for the sake of the carefully concealed advantages of the kolkhoz [collective farm] and sovkhoz [state farm] system.

Meanwhile peasant life is making its own choice. It is well known that up to 30 percent of agricultural output (apart from grain and cotton) is provided by garden plots which account for just two to three percent of cultivated land. And there are oblasts where kolkhozes and sovkhozes sell the state livestock of which two-thirds has been purchased from the population. But let us leave this dispute and the peasants, before whom the distant prospects of the lease system have opened up. Let us return to the city dwellers.

In addition to potatoes they grow vegetables, fruit, and berries. And 11 million people meet their own needs for vegetables and 17 million their own needs for fruit and berries. But even that turns out not to be all. Some people take some of what they grow to the bazaar. And if the procurement workers spared them any worries over sales, city dwellers could sell them another 54,000 tonnes of potatoes, 28,000 tonnes of fruit and berries, and 26,000 tonnes of vegetables and melons. That is from the 0.06 hectares on which a house with a garage often also stands.

Very well, let us allow that we somehow contrive to create a market even with our overall shortage, including a food shortage. But in that case how are we to construct social protection against it? Talk of money compensation, of unemployment benefits, and of control of prices for the most necessary items is good as a means of reassurance. But in reality a person can only be offered land for reliable protection.

The strength of the protection has been checked in Uzbekistan, where it is said there are 1 million unemployed yet somehow no protest demonstrations are to be seen, no demands for work are to be heard, and no crow of unemployed and hungry can be noted. Yet there really are unemployed people (just as there are vacant jobs). But there is also the practice of land holding. And you can live with a kitchen garden—after all, they did during the war.

Recalling that time, I begin to understand the people with choppers along the railroad. They are not only cultivating potatoes but also protecting themselves socially. Incidentally, half of urban families have living premises on their plots—again they can live. Some 30 percent of them have electricity, 49 percent have running water or a well or water hole, and nine percent even have gas.

A curious observation of the USSR State Committee for Statistics: Three quarters of owners of garden plots spend 20-40 days or more a year on them. That is their leave is already provided for.

Thus perhaps people should after all be given the choice? For instance, pensioners should either be given a supplement to their pension and a game of dominoes in the backyard, or his own land and a comfortable and dignified life. Land may be given, leased, or best of all sold.

They say people will not take it. Peasants will not take it, still less will city dwellers. First, if they do not take it, it will simply remain where it was—it will not spoil and it will not disappear. Second, today 1.2 million urban families are waiting for land. Of these 0.5 million have been patiently waiting 5-10 years and 200,000 have been waiting over 10 years. And they will not buy land?

Yet they are already buying it. They are giving good money for a ramshackle structure ready for demolition often 300 to 400 km from their home. And those plots which the local authorities allocate only slowly are not the closest and not the most fertile. On average it turns out that one trip there and back takes 1.8 hours. And how much effort, time, and money is needed to get the plot in decent order. Nonetheless people take the plots, travel, and work, and feel calm, safe, and independent.

But we have adopted a law on the land and its sale is not envisaged. Why am I nonetheless resolving to talk about this again? Because I am convinced that sooner or later we will sell the land anyway. To everyone without particular discrimination. To pensioners so that they spend less time playing dominoes. To cooperative members so that they have a raw material base. To prosperous families so that they can relax and grow flowers. To badly off families so that they can become prosperous. To peasants so that they can unite into collective farms and feed themselves and others. To all those who want land so that they can do what they want.

We shall come to this just as we came to the sale of apartments and the revision of prices after the introduction of economic accountability. But every spring lost in disputes and lost means a lost harvest, lost money, and lost faith in changes for the better. In general, whichever way you look at it, it is worth beginning with the land. At any rate the economy requires this. But unfortunately it seems that so far policy objects.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Council Meets in Latvia

LD0606210390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent N. Kasyanova]

[Text] The Baltic Council met again in Jurmala [in Latvia] today. The present meeting of the leaders of the governments of the three Baltic republics is an attempt to use joint efforts to untie the complicated knot of problems which have piled up.

[Kasyanova] Slightly less than a month ago the Baltic Council was set up and a joint declaration on the unanimity and cooperation between the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian Republics was adopted.

On 1 June in Riga representatives of the Bank of Estonia and Latvia discussed questions connected with the implementations of the law on the republics' economic independence, problems of inter-republican accounting and the setting up of computer centers and of a printing base needed for the changeover to their own money.

Today's meeting of the Baltic Council is confidential. The cameramen were only allowed to enter the meeting hall for a very limited time.

As local observers believe, the Council's members will discuss the results of the summit meeting, the route to the market, and the legal status of the transition period in order to conduct negotiations in Moscow on this basis. Thus, Riga is in the grip of intense political life. Will the meetings of the Baltic Council help stabilize the situation in the republics and will they untie the tight Baltic knot? Only time will tell. [Video shows Prunskiene, Landsbergis, Ruutel, Savisaar, Gorbunovs and others seated around a table. Savisaar has in front of him on the table a paper entitled "The Ecu-Key to Baltic Monetary Reform"; a document on the table in front of Gorbunovs is entitled "Baltic Economic Sovereignty Negotiations"]

Sends Telegram to Gorbachev

LD0606220490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2058 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Riga, 6 June (TASS)—TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina reports:

The second meeting of the Council of the Baltic States took place in the Latvian health resort of Jurmala. It was set up on 12 May in Estonia's capital, Tallinn, with the aim "of promoting the full restoration of the state independence of the three republics." At the present meeting the heads of the parliaments of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—Anatolijs Gorbunovs, Vitautas Landsbergis, and Arnold Ruutel—decided on the status of the council, the intervals between the meetings, and the forms of activity.

The participants in the meeting exchanged ratified agreements on economic cooperation between the three republics and signed the text of a telegram to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev in which they express the wish to hold a "joint meeting, preceding negotiations" with the leadership of the union.

They addressed a statement of the Council of the Baltic Republics to the parliaments and governments of the countries of the world, expressing "the conviction that when concluding international treaties concerning political and economic matters or on the territories, water areas, and airspace of the three Baltic states the sovereign rights and interests of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia be taken into account."

During this time the heads of governments of the three republics discussed "questions of economic and social assistance to Lithuania."

At a news conference, the leaders of the three republics noted the great importance of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit for the future of Europe and the USSR. They stressed that "it would only be possible to assess in due time the consequences of the meeting for the destinies of the Baltic region." In doing so Vitautas Landsbergis reiterated that it is impossible to rescind the 11 March declaration on the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state.

In the view of Latvian leader Anatolijs Gorbunovs, the discussion on the concept of negotiations in Moscow and on the economic and legal status of the transition period proclaimed in all three republics was one of the important factors at the conference.

Replying to a question about the prospects for a referendum on the independence issue, the leaders of the Baltic republics did not consider it necessary or expedient to hold one.

Before the end of the meeting, which is expected by morning, a number of documents, particularly "The Decision of the Meeting of the Council of Baltic States" are still to be signed. This document provides for expanding cooperation in all spheres and for regular contacts at the level of government commissions, ministers, expert groups, and so on.

Discusses Political Alliance

LD0606155590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Lithuania Today" program, presented by Jurate Valanciute]

[Text] Riga: A meeting of chairmen of the Supreme Council of the Baltic republics is under way—a sitting of the Baltic Council.

My colleague, Ante Busa from Latvian radio reports:

[Busa, in Russian] The Baltic Council meeting began in Jurmala [a suburb of Riga]. Three presidents of Baltic

republics are taking part—A. Gorbunovs, Latvia; A. Ruutel, Estonia; and Vytautas Landsbergis, Lithuania. Other government representatives are also taking part.

Reports are coming in that Saavisar and Prunskiene have also arrived and it has also been reported that Godmanis will take part in the talks.

The topic under discussion, naturally, is our three Baltic republics and their future political alliance.

Of course, the results of the talks between President Bush and M. Gorbachev will not be passed over without discussion. The relationship with the new government of the Russian Federation—as is known, Boris Yeltsin has been elected president there—will also be discussed.

Apart from this, today the participants of the Baltic Council will take part in the television bridge between Latvian and France.

At 1545 GMT a press confrence will be broadcast on Latvian television with participants in the Baltic Council, where the results of this meeting will be made public.

Leaders Comment on U.S.-USSR Summit

LD0606200990 Paris TF1 Television in French 1800 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Telebridge from Riga, Latvia, featuring Baltic Council participants Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis, Latvian President Anatolijs Gorbunovs, and Estonian President Arnold Ruutel with newscaster Patrick Poivre d'Arvor—live; Landsbergis, Gorbunovs, and Ruutel speak in thier native languages with superimposed French translation]

[Excerpts] [Newscaster Poivre d'Arvor] At this stage in the newscast we have a picture, a symbolic picture, a picture with strong appeal. It is the first time that you will be able to see the picture of these three presidents on television anywhere in the world. You see on the left Vytautas Landsbergis, the Lithuanian president, then Anatolijs Gorbunovs, the Latvian president, and Arnold Ruutel, the Estonian president. At their side is Robert Werner who organized this minisummit in Riga for us. It is thus there that we can question these three presidents. [video shows three presidents seated at tables with Correspondent Werner] [passage omitted]

[Poivre d'Arvor] Arnold Ruutel, you are the Estonian president. Are you not disappointed by the results of the Bush-Gorbachev summit? Did it not succeed somewhat at your expense?

[Ruutel] Obviously it did not at all fulfil our hopes. Let us hope at any rate that they will accept and will adopt a point of view on the problems of our Baltic countries. They are countries to which a destiny has been denied.

[Landsbergis] We will know about this in about a week's time. If nothing changes, if the blockade remains as solid as it is today, then in that case we will (?really think this way).

[Gorbunov] I am not very disappointed by this because I already knew beforehand what President Bush's position would be, and also that of President Mitterrand [as heard]. I already knew more or less what the result would be.

[Poivre d'Arvor] Vytautas Landsbergis, are you suffering, are you beginning to suffer from the Soviet embargo?

[Landsbergis] People are suffering in our country because it is not just physical torture, it is above all pyschological torture, because our future has suddenly become uncertain—and we always have this fear that force may be used against us.

[Poivre d'Arvor] It is thus with this symbolic picture of these three presidents of the Baltic republics that we are now going to leave you and I thank all three of you for having agreed to reply to our questions and those of Robert Werner.

Lithuania Issues Communique on Economic Situation

LD0606203190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Communique by the Lithuanian Government on the economic situation in the republic; read by announcer]

[Text] On the 49th day of the economic blockade in Lithuania the electric power situation in the republic has not improved. Only one generator is operating at the Ignalina nuclear power station. The Lithuanian state regional station, operating on a regime only to ensure the safety of the Ignalina nuclear power station, has not received any fuel. Because of the colder weather and increased consumption, the Lithuanian state regional station operated today at a higher capacity. The republican government insists that the responsible authorities in the USSR solve the problem of supplying fuel to the Lithuanian state regional power station.

At today's government commission meeting on regulating the economic situation, the Ministry of Agriculture stated that there is an acute shortage of lubricants for agricultural transport. Although the interested organizations are taking all possible measures, only some consumers can be supplied with these products. In endeavoring to envisage the propects of life in Lithuania until the end of this year, it is essential to make a thorough assessment of the ability to supply food products, especially meat. The Ministry of Agriculture was instructed to prepare this year's plan for the production of meat and its distribution to the consumers by tomorrow as well as to make specific proposals which will be submitted to the state antiblockade commission.

As a result of the whole set of negative consquences of the economic blockade, the problem of prices is difficult to solve. Shortages are increasing and since enterprises are not working at full capacity and power resources are becoming more expensive, the cost of making many products is increasing. With a natural increase in prices, the solution to all social problems will be more complicated. The Ministries of Economics and Trade, together with other interested departments, were instructed to examine this problem as soon as possible and submit it for examination to the state Antiblockade Commission.

Update on Economic Losses

LD0606223390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1920 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] According to information from the Statistical Department derived from estimates by enterprises, by 4 June losses due to the Lithuanian blockade reached 74 million rubles [R], an increased during the week of almost R10 million.

Sugar refineries which ceased production, failed to produce 38,000 tonnes of sugar, or 10 kg per capita; 288 million tonnes of gas [as heard] were not produced. This is equal to 103 days consumption in the republic. Many other products were not manufactured.

There are great losses in the transport sector. Profits to the tune of R13.8 million were lost. Of the total number of trucks, 14.2% are not working. The population is experiencing great inconvenience due to the abolition of 441,000 passenger-trips, or 32% of the bus routes in the timetable.

Losses at agricultural enterprises amount to R2.6 million. The building industry failed to use R13.9 million for construction work; this is 14% of the monthly quota. In May the Lietuvos Statyba Association alone failed to hand over about 150 appartments for occupancy.

Because of economic disturbances the republic's budget failed over a two- month period to receive payments totalling R70 million. Savings in the saving bank declined in May by R59.3 million. The plan for payments into the bank was unfulfilled by R35.9 million. During the month, withdrawals amounted to R50 million.

Lithuania To Receive Non-Prohibited Goods Via Rail

LD0606204390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] The government of the Republic of Lithuania has received a telegram from Moscow, from the Soviet Union's Ministry of Transport. The first deputy minister, (Ginkov), states, and we quote: The Soviet Union's Ministry of Transport has instructed the heads of railways to ensure the loading of all kinds of material for the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic in accordance with the transportation plan. The stances known to you are exceptions and they do not stem from railwaymen. End of quotation.

By the way, those stances represent many raw materials and products: zinc sheet steel, all kinds of pipes, oil products, plastics, timber, paper, metal constructions, synthetic and artificial fibers, motor vehicles, tractors, sugar, coffee. The complete list of raw materials and products which are prohibited for dispatch to Lithuania was published by ELTA on 28 April.

Commentary Views Political Situation in Baltics

LD0606160490 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Commentary by Yuriy Rogachev]

[Text] At a meeting in Riga, capital of Latvia, the parliamentary chairmen and prime ministers of the three Baltic republics are discussing the results of the Soviet-American summit as relating to the Baltic area. I was not surprised that the Lithuanian issue did not become the main condition on which the successful completion of the talks between the Soviet and American presidents, Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, would depend, said the prime minister of the Lithuanian republic Mrs. Kazimiera Prunskiene in an interview over the Lithuanian radio. I think, writes our commentator Yuriy Rogachev, that this does not surprise the residents of the other republics either, who expected much from this summit, and hoped for a weighed reaction of President Bush to the developments in Lithuania.

The issue of Lithuania was not the center of the talks, though it was discussed. Apparently the discussions could clarify the stands of the two presidents, but this internal issue for the USSR will have to be resolved presumably at direct talks between the Lithuanian and the Soviet Union's leaders. The unilateral declaration of independence by Lithuania, and following that by Latvia and Estonia, has created a highly tense situation in this country. Part of the population of these three republics express disagreement with the separatist ambitions of the leaders at rallies, demonstrations, and during political strikes. Another part of their populations support their leaders. Moscow's economic sanctions against Lithuania, imposed for the one-sided violation of the republic's union commitments, have produced different response among the public.

On the one hand one can understand the striving of the center to show in real terms the adverse effect of the severance of the republics' comprehensive ties with the union. On the other hand there is sympathy for the people of Lithuania, who experience all the bad effects of the economic sanctions. Many people wonder whether such sanctions will be extended to Latvia and Estonia. So what will be the further moves by the Soviet president?

During a speech in the United States, President Gorbachev pointed out again that the Soviet leadership

hoped to find a political solution to the problem. That means direct political dialogue, if necessary. Why doesn't it start? The Soviet president has answered the question several times. The issue must be resolved within the USSR Constitution, and not on the basis of the unilateral backing down on their union commitments by the three Baltic republics. The Soviet leader also stressed that no one doubted the right of the republics to secede from the union. The Soviet national parliament has passed a special law to have this right realized. The law provides for finding out the will of the entire population of the republic via a referendum, but there have been no referendums in Lithuania, Latvia, or Estonia.

A further build-up of tension in the relations between the Baltic republics and the center will benefit no one. The way out of the critical situation does not lie in confrontation. It is necessary to look for compromise decisions; steps should be taken to meet one another halfway. Having agreed to the suspension—not to repeal as it was earlier insisted—of the declarations of independence by the Baltic republics, the center awaits the next compromise move from the leadership of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The near future will show whether such moves are to be made.

RSFSR

RSFSR Congress Resumes 7 June

LD0706071790 Moscow TASS in English 0647 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow June 7 TASS—The top legislative body of Russia—the Congress of People's Deputies—is today moving to law-making, Boris Yeltsin, president of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, told the morning session.

The deputies are expected to change a number of articles in the republican constitution. By a majority of votes the congress declared in favour of increasing the number of delegates to the two chambers of Russia's parliament—the Council of the Republic and the Council of Nationalities—with a view to creating an effective working parliament. This decision requires constitutional amendments.

People's Deputy of the Russian Federation Vladimir Isakov, a lawyer from Sverdlovsk, southern Urals, spoke on behalf of the working group that prepared amendments to the constitution.

Moscow TV Relays 6 June Proceedings

LD0606182190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 6 June begins carrying a recording of the 6 June proceedings at the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1500 GMT, the relay of the morning session starts. Yeltsin chairs with Khasbulatov beside him. Everyone rises to salute the flag; 907 deputies are reported present.

At 1503 GMT, Deputy Nazarchuk rejects accusations that his group of agrarians tries to block the Congress' work.

At 1505 GMT, Arutyunov suggests that autonomous entities should be given more rights.

At 1508 GMT, Deputy Gorelov speaks about procedure for electing the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Another deputy speaks on the subject.

At 1512 GMT, a woman deputy stresses the need to comply with existing rules and the Constitution when electing the Supreme Soviet.

At 1517 GMT, a deputy from the commission on state sovereignty says that an unauthorized draft declaration is being circulated and chides the authors for breaking the rules.

At 1519 GMT, Abdulatipov argues for equal numbers of deputies in both chambers of the future Supreme Soviet.

At 1529 GMT, Yeltsin closes debate on the subject. He says that yesterday he met a group of deputies from autonomous regions to discuss the capacity of the chambers. The figure of 163 people was put forward as a compromise solution. Amendments to the Constitution will be adopted later. The figure of 163 members in each chamber is put to a vote: 761 for, 187 against, 21 abstained. The measure is adopted. Discussion follows of an amendment on releasing members of Supreme Soviet of their current posts. A vote is taken on whether the issue should be examined now: 740 for, 215 against—it is adopted.

At 1532 GMT, Deputy Kaufman says the amendment should not be adopted. Another deputy suggests there should be separate voting with respect to the chambers.

At 1535 GMT, a military deputy defines the difference between equal numbers and equality of the chambers. Another deputy urges others to show more respect for the existing Constitution.

At 1538 GMT, Deputy Vishnyakov suggests a compromise solution. Another deputy suggest setting up a three-chamber Supreme Soviet.

At 1542 GMT, discussion is held about whether work at the Supreme Soviet should be regarded as a permanent and sole job.

At 1547 GMT, Yeltsin suggests that the discussion of the feasibility of combining both local and Supreme Soviet jobs should be put to a vote: it is adopted. Yeltsin

reminds representatives of autonomous regions that yesterday they agreed to this principle. Now the issue itself is put to a vote: 695 for, 202 against, 31 abstained—adopted. Yeltsin invites small autonomies, such as small peoples of the North, to ponder the problem of how they could nominate more deputies.

At 1554 GMT, Yeltsin reads out a list of the juridical group for formulating constitutional amendments. Comments on people included in the group follows.

At 1557 GMT, relay is discontinued: session takes a 15-minute break.

1613 GMT

LD0606180790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1613 GMT on 6 June resumes its recording of the 6 June proceedings at the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

Discussion of the members nominated for the juridical group continues. A deputy suggests that a constitutional commission be elected right away. Another deputy speaks against Deputy Slobodkin and General Tarasov being included in the group. Other deputies propose new names for the group. Session votes to end discussion.

At 1620 GMT, Yeltsin suggests that Slobodkin be put to a vote, but a deputy angrily objects that this is an insult to a respected deputy. Yeltsin then proposes voting on each name on the list. The voting starts. Everyone on the list is approved, including Slobodkin.

At 1638 GMT, additional candidates to the group are voted on. Yeltsin reads a note saying that USSR people's deputies are present and asks them to leave the hall. Controversy arises as a deputy rejects this allegation: There are no USSR deputies here. Yeltsin reads the names of those who signed the list. General commotion. The note proves to be correct and someone is forced to leave the hall.

At 1643 GMT, voting resumes on General Tarasov to be included in the group: adopted. Voting on Shakhray: adopted. Voting on Surkov, a lawyer from Moscow: rejected.

At 1650 GMT, Yeltsin sums up: 15 members of the group have been approved; they should start work immediately.

At 1652 GMT, Yeltsin moves discussion on the mechanisms of forming the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

At 1658 GMT, a deputy says the nationalism of autonomous entities is growing in the audience. He produces figures showing that Russian representation in the chambers will be at a disadvantage due to the current election procedure.

At 1657 GMT, Dunayev from Kaliningrad calls for real equality of peoples regardless of nationality. Nationality should not be a reason for appointment to a post. The national problem can be solved through improving social and economic conditions, but not through preferential treatment.

1704 GMT

LD0606182990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1704 GMT on 6 June continues its recording of the 6 June proceedings at the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Semyakin calls for more correct behavior by deputies toward each other. He stresses the need not to infringe on the rights of the elected people's deputies.

At 1706 GMT, Deputy Vishnyakov speaks in favor of adopting the mode of selecting the Supreme Soviet advocated recently by Shakray.

At 1710 GMT, Deputy Lunev says that people's deputies should represent everyone's interests, and not specifically the peoples of the autonomous republics or the Russian republic in general.

AT 1711 GMT, Deputy Chitin speaks of the difficulties of the deputies who also represent small nationalities. He represents the Komi-Permak people.

At 1714 GMT, Yeltsin answers a query about why he does not use an official vehicle. He says the Supreme Soviet, which we shall be forming, has not yet decided on how many official vehicles there will be.

At 1716 GMT, there is an interval in the recording of the RSFSR Congress proceedings. An account of correspondents' interviews with various people's deputies attending the Congress is given. Those interviewed include Tiunov, chairman of the commission drafting the declaration on the sovereignty of Russia, and others.

At 1726 GMT, the recording of the session resumes. Yeltsin gives the floor to Deputy Gorelov of Moscow Oblast, who stresses the importance of the procedure for selection of the Supreme Soviet. He says it is impossible for any deputy conscientiously to vote either for or against more than 10 or so of the names. He does not know the other deputies well enough. He advocates a minimum quota of various groups by profession in the formation of the Supreme Soviet. He says the Supreme Soviet should match the makeup of the present Congress and not just reflect regional representation.

At 1730 GMT, another deputy says that fixing the strength of the Supreme Soviet chambers at 163 will not allow the Supreme Soviet to sufficiently reflect the professional makeup of the present Congress.

At 1735 GMT, a deputy says the Supreme Soviet's makeup should reflect the various groups in the Congress.

At 1738 GMT, a deputy advocates rotating membership in the Supreme Soviet chambers.

At 1740 GMT, Deputy Zhigulin says delegations should nominate their candidates for the Supreme Soviet.

At 1745 GMT, Deputy Yevtushenko stresses the difficult situation of the small peoples of the North. The size of the chambers should be increased.

At 1749 GMT, Yeltsin suggests Shakhray select a commission which should work out quotas for both chambers. The congress approves this.

At 1756 GMT, a deputy suggests representatives of different groups be elected to the Supreme Soviet. Another deputy recalls internationally accepted rules for forming parliaments.

1800 GMT

LD0606201390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 6 June continues its recording of the 6 June proceedings at the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

Yeltsin reads a note alleging that Slobodkin was insulted by another deputy. A commission for ethics will be set up.

At 1803 GMT, Rasskazov suggests submitting all the proposals to the Shakhray commission. More competition in election from territories should be ensured.

At 1809 GMT, Bogdanov is warned against confronting nations and national districts. Autonomous entities are worried about the prospects of becoming dependent of raw materials for a greater Russia.

At 1814 GMT, Chernov from Komsomolsk-on-Amur says only seven percent of representatives of peasants and workers are candidates to the Supreme Soviet. They should be given a chance, however.

At 1818 GMT, Shelov-Kavadyayev presents his view on formation of the Supreme Soviet.

At 1822 GMT, Deputy Kim highlights the problem of small nationality representation in the Supreme Soviet. Deputy Levykin speaks about the possibly dangerous consequences of the confrontation that has taken shape at the Congress over the future composition of the Supreme Soviet. As a result, mediocrities may become elected. He proposes a different system of election to the Supreme Soviet.

At 1831 GMT, the congress votes to end discussion.

At 1833 GMT, Yeltsin reads a list of the group which will sum up all the proposals. The list is approved.

At 1836 GMT, Yeltsin denies rumors about his bad health, to general cheers.

At 1836 GMT, Grachev, head of the secretariat, explains some procedural matters: on deputies' requests, circulation of documents. There are 32 officially registered groups at the Congress. Those absent from the Congress discussed.

At 1840 GMT, Khasbulatov invited to give his view on formation of the Supreme Soviet. The quota of 163 seems the most feasible: No one's rights are encroached upon.

At 1843 GMT, various announcements are read.

At 1845 GMT, a break is announced.

1846 GMT

LD0606211190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1846 GMT on 6 June continues its recording of the 6 June proceedings at the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1846 GMT, a report shows interviews with RSFSR people's deputies. Valentin Tsoy praises Yeltsin's astuteness in chairing the Congress. Deputy Astafyev argues with Tsoy about some details of what has taken place.

At 1850 GMT, deputies from the "Chernobyl" group are interviewed about their achievements and worries.

At 1852 GMT, the relay of evening session begins. Ryabinskiy from the Editorial Commission speaks about work on a draft resolution on the report on Russia's social and economic situation.

At 1856 GMT, the congress votes to adopt the draft resolution as a basis: 755 for, 28 against.

At 1858 GMT, Deputy Churkin comments on the resolution. Deputy Altukhov criticizes the draft's wording as too mild.

At 1904 GMT, more deputies comment on the draft. Deputy Surkov reminds everyone how difficult it was to include this point on the agenda against the resistance of the outgoing government. The activity of the former government should be appraised.

At 1915 GMT, Deputy Kryuchenko criticizes the present draft resolution. He condemns it as empty of meaning and opposes debate on it.

At 1917 GMT, Deputy Pimenov from the Komi republic supports the draft resolution in the main as being well balanced. He suggests a few amendments, however.

At 1920 GMT, Deputy Kuznetsov wants the CPSU Central Committee to be blamed for the present sorry state of Russia.

At 1922 GMT, Deputies Nelasov and Yevtushenko suggest various amendments to draft. Yevtushenko criticizes the measures taken in connection with the Chernobyl accident.

At 1924 GMT, Deputy Zavgayev suggest amendments on the causes of ethnic unrest.

At 1926 GMT, Deputy Koronets speaks of the draft's purpose. It is not to condemn the government, but to simply record the present situation in the republic.

At 1927 GMT, Deputy Guskov suggests a few amendments stressing various priorities.

At 1929 GMT, Deputy Sheynis thinks that the text of the draft can be improved. He thinks the present draft is inferior to various versions previously proposed. He thinks there is need to stress Russian sovereignty and the implementation of radical economic reforms.

At 1932 GMT, Khasbulatov, who is now chairing the session, calls for more precision in proposed amendments.

At 1933 GMT, Deputy Lyubimov criticizes wording of draft.

At 1935 GMT, an unidentified deputy says reasons for the present situation should be stated in the draft resolution.

At 1939 GMT, Deputies Luchinskiy and Nunayev speak. Deputy Nesterov opposes the present draft resolution as unsatisfactory. It should indicate the way out of the present crisis.

At 1940 GMT, Deputy Sergeyev compares the proceedings to the theater of the absurd. The country is in crisis, and deputies make rhetorical points over formulations.

At 1941 GMT, Deputy Ryzhov is not satisfied with the present document. He says Vlasov and Vorotnikov should be reproached for the slowness in which Russia has realized the need for a market economy.

At 1946 GMT, Deputy Ryabinskiy answers some of the points made by deputies.

At 1948 GMT, Khasbulatov says the draft resolution obviously needs to be broadened. He says if there are no objections, this course will be followed without a vote. It is agreed.

1950 GMT

LD0606212490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1950 GMT on 6 June continues its recording of the 6 June proceedings at the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Poptsov says a principled assessment on the work of the RSFSR government is needed.

At 1951 GMT, a vote is proposed on whether an assessment of the government should be given. Khasbulatov asks who is in favor of a roll-call vote. A vote is taken on this. The majority is in favor of a roll-call vote on whether an assessment of the government should be given.

At 1954 GMT, Khasbulatov takes a vote on who is in favor of an assessment. The vote is 473 for, 410 against, and 50 abstentions. The resolution is not adopted.

At 1958 GMT, Khasbulatov says the next item on the agenda is the formation of the constitutional commission. He reads out a draft resolution on the proposed members of the constitutional commission under Yeltsin's chairmanship.

At 2004 GMT, an Archangel deputy is surprised at the choice of the deputy from their group. A Khakas deputy says similar things about their representatives. General disorder erupts in the hall; Khasbulatov appeals for calm. Yeltsin takes over the chair and urges the deputies to return to their seats. Yeltsin gives the background for nominations to the commission: Over 100 people were nominated, which was too many, so the commission had to be trimmed down to 50-60 people. Besides, nearly half the territories have not submitted the minutes of the meetings at which candidates to the commission were nominated.

At 2013 GMT, a vote is taken on whether representatives of all national and territorial formations should be on the commission. It is adopted: 536 for, 306 against.

At 2016 GMT, Khasbulatov again chairs.

At 2018 GMT, a deputy questions the procedure for drawing up the list of members of the constitutional commission.

At 2020 GMT, Deputy Brichalov from Taymyr says that only SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA covers the Congress and even that inadequately. We need a newspaper of our own, he says. He describes the plight of those who live in his region.

At 2024 GMT, Repin from Naberezhnaya Chelny cannot start because of noise from the audience. He suggests providing bodyguards for Yeltsin, citing the recent accident with Ryzhkov. Another deputy supports the idea and demands a vote. Khasbulatov puts forward proposals to this effect. They are not adopted because their is no quorum.

At 2032 GMT, a deputy suggests that the former chairman's bodyguards should be transferred to Yeltsin. Then he raises the problem of refugees who should be taken care of. He criticizes those who stress national issues too much.

At 2035 GMT, Khasbulatov again tries to calm down the audience. A deputy speaks about the problem of finding jobs for teenagers.

At 2038 GMT, Deputy Zadonskiy says they should keep an eye on what is going on at the USSR Supreme Soviet

because many of the laws they adopt over there may interfere with Russian sovereignty.

At 2042 GMT, Khasbulatov reads a list of members of a commission for distributing information about the Congress. Other names are suggested to complement the commission.

At 2047 GMT, Deputy Bondarev from Democratic Platform says his colleagues from the Communists of Russia are destructive in their behavior and have already put forward shameful proposals, obviously in collusion with the Central Committee, as they hold separate meetings together.

At 2051 GMT, various announcments follow, and the relay ends.

Draft Statement on Right To Secede Cited

AU0706083490 Paris AFP in English 0121 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 7 (AFP)—The Russian Republic "reserves the right to secede from the Soviet Union," according to a draft statement revealed by the republic's new president Boris Yeltsin, the Moscow Radio publication INTERFAX said Wednesday.

"The state sovereignty of the Russian Federal Republic is proclaimed in the name of the legitimate right of each individual to a decent life, free development, the use of the language of his birth, and in the name of the right of all peoples to self-determination in the form of a nation-state and a national culture," the draft statement said. The statement was being prepared for legislative approval by members of the Russian Congress of People's Deputies.

Within hours of his election last week as president of the powerful Russian republic, Mr. Yeltsin had said he would seek to have the Russian legislature adopt a declaration on the republic's sovereignty in time for Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's return from the United States.

The draft envisages setting up "plenipotentiary Russian representations" in the other Soviet republics and abroad, and claims for the Russian people the exclusive right to dispose of the natural resources in its territory. Russia produces 90 per cent of the Soviet Union's oil and 70 per cent of its gas.

Russia "reserves the right to secede freely from the Soviet Union," the draft declaration says. The Russian republic "recognizes and respects the sovereign rights of the Soviet Union and its republics."

Strong Support for Russian Party Displayed

PM0606131990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Single Edition p 7

[Unattributed report: "'For' or 'Against'? More Than 80 Percent of Poll Participants Support Organizational Registration of Russian Federation Communists"]

[Text] Discussion of the basic documents for the 28th Party Congress—the drafts of the CPSU Central Committee platform and the draft party statutes—is taking place amid heated and trenchant debates. The political intensity of these debates is reflected in readers' letters arriving these days at the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA editorial office. Essentially, there is not a single section of the platform, nor a single paragraph of the statutes about which differing, and at times even opposing, viewpoints have not been voiced, and regarding which a host of specific comments, amendments, and proposals have not been submitted.

What does the party represent today in its social makeup? Is it the party of the working class, as was maintained only recently, or has this social orientation ended to some degree? Does the CPSU occupy vangard positions in today's conditions, or, in putting forward the task of preserving this role for the party in the future too, are we embellishing the real situation? Will the measures proposed in the documents for the 28th Congress guarantee a genuinely radical restructuring of the party on the basis of the democratization of intraparty relations, or is it possible to effect no more than cosmetic repairs with their help? The acuteness of these and other questions arising during discussion of the draft documents testifies in itself to the desire of communists for an honest and frank analysis of the state of the party, its activity, and its present status in society.

V. Grigoryev, a reader of the paper from Syzran writes: "It is now, when perestroyka is running into many difficulties, that we communists, guided by our party conscience, must ask ourselves the question: Why has the party's authority with the people been so shaken, and what needs to be done to boost its authority? And that means boosting it in reality, since more than enough promises and assurances have been issued."

The SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA editorial office, in conjunction with the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociology Public Opinion Research Center, carried out a poll in 38 primary party organizations in the Russian Federation, asking its participants to express their attitude to the CPSU Central Committee platform, and the 28th Party Congress. During the investigation, the scientific management of which was carried out by V. Davydchenkov, V. Rodionov, and V. Afanasyev, staffers of the center, answers were received from 1,274 communists. The geography of the poll took in large cities, such as Moscow, Gorkiy, Leningrad, and Yaroslavl, and urban settlements, kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms], affording a basis to speak of a sufficiently broad sample of public opinion.

Judging by the readers' mailbag, one of the serious problems around which passions are boiling is the question of the autonomy of the communist parties of the Union republics. Events of recent months, especially in the Baltic region, have posed this question with special urgency. What then is the attitude of Russian Federation communists to this question, what is their position and their view of the processes which are taking place? Here is what the answers of the participants of the investigation revealed (figures in percentages): 73.2—the rights of union republic communist parties must be widened, but the CPSU Program and Statutes must remain the basis of their activity; 21.7—the communist party of each republic may work out its own program and statutes, but the CPSU must take on the role of a union or an association of friendly communist parties; 3.1—I am of a different opinion; 2.0—don't know.

Such is the attitude of communists to the problem as a whole. As we can see, an absolute majority of those polled (94.9 percent) in a very decisive way support the idea of a major broadening of the rights and autonomy of the republics' party organizations. In the context of this problem there exists also the question of the organizational registration of Russian Federation communists. Those who object to such a step rightly note, for instance, that Russia's communists constitute 57.8 percent of the total figure for the country's territorial party organizations—that is, most of the party. Fears are being expressed that, by registering as an autonomous party, this majority in certain circumstances could impose its will on the CPSU.

"The Russian Party Conference should take just one decision—for a unified CPSU with a uniform platform and statutes," I. Yeliseyev, a veteran communist writes to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

But there are arguments (and no less earnest ones at that) in favor of a Russian Communist Party. A Russian Communist Party would become a sort of pivot for strengthening the organizational and ideological unity of the CPSU, say the advocates in the Russian Federation of an autonomous communist party.

"It seems to me that the question is perfectly clear," V. Petrov, a reader from Ryazan Oblast, says in defense of his viewpoint. "If I were elected a delegate to the congress, I would definitely support the formation of a Russian Communist Party. The decision to set up the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau was a half-measure; Russia's communists deserve the right to have their own communist party, as have the other republic's of our union."

In short, there are many arguments both "for" and "against." One thing is clear: The final decision is for the communists of the Russian Federation themselves to take. The results of the poll, in which the question "What is your attitude to the proposal to set up an RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party?" was posed, are interesting in this connection. The answers (in percentages) showed the following picture: 8.4—there is no necessity to set up leading organs uniting the RSFSR's party organizations; 6.3—some organizational structures uniting RSFSR communists, must emerge but no republican party should exist, 53.8—all the leading organs which the communist parties of the union republics possess should also be set up in the RSFSR, 27.2—an autonomous communist party must be set up in the RSFSR, with its own program and statutes, 2.0—I am of a different opinion, 2.2—don't know.

Thus more than 80 percent of those polled view the idea of forming of a Russian Communist Party positively.

The question is in order: Who is dedicated to this idea most of all? Party veterans or young communists, and the representatives of what social groups? The results of the investigation allow us to make an unequivocal inference: Advocates of an organizational registration of a Russian Federation Communist Party represent all age categories and all social groups. Among those who advocate the formation of an RSFSR Communist Party with its own program and statutes: 29 percent are communists with more than 30 years membership, 28 percent are workers, and 21 percent are party workers.

Naturally, around 1,300 poll participants is only a small proportion of the communists in the Russian Federation. But their opinion, like the opinion of hundreds and hundreds of readers of this newspaper, allow us to trace the manifest interest of communists in forming an autonomous party in the largest of the union republics.

Creation of Russian Communist Party Discussed

PM0606105990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Single Edition p 5

[A. Gamov feature under rubric "Preparing for Russian Party Conference": "This Is the Path Toward Unification"—first paragraph is an introduction; boldface text are readers' letters]

[Text] A meeting was held at Moscow State University between members of the Russian Party Conference Preparatory Committee—G.K. Rebrov, delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress and docent at the Moscow State University Faculty of Economics Political Economy Department; V.A. Tyulkin, secretary of Leningrad's "Avangard" Science and Production Association party committee; and V.M. Pashchenko, secretary of Krasnoyarsk Kray's "Yastrebovskiy" Sovkhoz [state farm] party committee—and delegates to the Second Initiative Congress of Russia's Communists from Moscow City and Oblast. In essence, the excerpts from the conversation which ensued and which we publish today, offer answers to numerous questions received by the editorial office from our readers in the past few days.

The reason why union republics need their own communist parties is generally understandable: The very fact of their existence testifies that a given republic enjoys political autonomy. But why did the Russians suddenly find it necessary to set up their own communist party—after all, they have one to all intents and purposes. Suffice it to say that the bulk of CPSU members are communists living in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], and the leadership comprises mainly representatives of Russia's indigenous nationalities. Is it not likely that, when the Russian Communist Party is created, we will end up with two leading party centers in Moscow, duplicating one another? This is hardly likely to promote the cause.
N. Benediktova, Tashkent

V.A. Tyulkin: The idea of creating a Russian Communist Party emerged relatively recently. But it gained numerous supporters within a brief time period. This affirms yet again its viability and topicality. I do think, however, that we all will be very dissatisfied if, having organizationally shaped the Russian Communist Party, we end up with an exact copy of the party we have now, a party that is torn apart by contradictions and finds itself in a state of crisis. Therefore, if we were to speak in general terms about the reason why a Russian Communist Party is needed, I would briefly formulate the answer to this question thus: It is needed in order to preserve the communist principle within the CPSU.

G.K. Rebrov: I would like to make the following point in this context. We cannot but be disturbed by the agitation around the idea of creating a Russian Communist Party which developed in the last few months. Its opponents are not squeamish even about using methods like disinformation and distortion of facts, exploiting some mass media for this purpose. Many publications simply keep silent about the work being done by the CPSU Central Committee and the Russian Party Conference Preparatory Committee. Hence the sundry misinterpretations which do not help stability in society.

I can say one thing: We do not in any way intend to create a "second party center." The Russian Communist Party—if we succeed in organizationally shaping it—will function within the CPSU's framework and on its ideological basis. Such a situation is hardly likely to lead to any conflicts.

V.M. Pashchenko: I would like to see the forthcoming party conference—just like, incidentally, the creation of the Russian Communist Party—primarily as bolshevik in spirit. We should not get carried away by debates on how to build party structures—lengthwise or breadthways, vertically or horizontally. Indeed, we must get it clear in our minds from the very beginning: Why is a Russian Communist Party needed? Where will it lead the people? Will it reflect the interests of ordinary working people? These are by no means idle questions, they must be included on the conference agenda and make us think of many things.... Primarily the reason why words like "party apparatus" and many others of that ilk are being used almost as insults, while many people feel embarrassed to admit that they are communists. **The idea of convening a Russian Party Conference was put forward back at the CPSU Central Committee March (1990) Plenum. It is taking a long time to materialize. And this is happening in our tumultuous and fast-changing times. Could it be that someone is having doubts about the wisdom of launching a discussion about internal Russian party affairs and conducting it in full view of the public? Meanwhile the need for it has been pressing for a long time. Political streams pulling backwards or sideways have emerged within the party. Back in April, the press carried a brief report that a Russian Party Conference Organizational Committee had been created at a sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau. What has it been doing all this time? Has there been any movement to break the standstill?**
K. Mordvintsev, Moscow

V.A. Tyulkin: Frankly speaking, our preparatory committee started functioning at full speed literally last week, when everyone realized that the Russian Communist Party will come into being, and indignation was expressed by the majority of committee members: How long can we wait? Now, simply speaking, we are catching up. Our schedule could not be tighter and, with god's help, we will succeed in "wringing out" whatever we can from the material at our disposal. I mean not just the alternative drafts but also the multitude of letters received by the preparatory committee. A computer is being used to process them, remarks and proposals are being analyzed and summed up. We are striving to take into account as much as possible from the material received from localities. We are also striving to maintain close contacts with grassroot party organizations. After all, the documents we intend to submit to the conference must be the fruit of collective labor.

G.K. Rebrov: One of the preparatory committee's groups, to which I belong, is presently working on the main report. It must be heard at the conference. I think that the track which the discussion will follow can already be seen from the report's title, even though it is still only provisional—"For a Leninist-Type Party, for Socialism and a Communist Future."

I would like to mention that this political document is still far from perfect and is still vague when it comes to organizational practicalities. But the ideas which are propounded leave no room for doubt. The report primarily substantiates the thesis that the Russian Communist Party as a political vanguard must be built solely on Leninist principles, on the basis of democratic centralism. Much attention has been given to the Russian Communist Party's functions and its organizational building based on the production-territorial principle. Many other matters of party building are being analyzed and this will no doubt contribute toward an active and fruitful debate...

But perhaps the report's most complex section is the one dealing with questions associated with the introduction

of a regulated market economy in our country. Bluntly speaking, many of my colleagues are scared by the word "regulated." What does it mean—camouflaged "planning system?" Preservation of the administrative edict system. If so, why make all the fuss? Briefly speaking, there are numerous debates on this question also in our preparatory committee. We are striving to prove to the comrades that paramount importance in this still unusual word collocation attaches to the word "market," and "regulated" is of secondary importance. I do think, however, that all these doubts are perfectly understandable. And we are striving to ensure that the report and the resolution on the report contain precise and clear formulations on all problems now perturbing Russia's communists.

Seeing that the Central Committee plenum decided the question of convening the Russian Party Conference, what was the point of holding all those informal initiative and extraordinary congresses? Is it that their organizers do not trust the Central Committee, or is it that someone's ambitions have come to the surface? Is it not likely that Russia will suddenly gain several communist parties, as it happened for example with the MSZMP [Hungarian Socialist Workers Party] in Hungary recently? And what do these extraordinary initiative gatherings produce—they only distract communists from the cause and confuse them. It would be interesting to find out the attitude toward this phenomenon adopted by those who, in fulfillment of the Central Committee plenum resolution, are preparing the Russian Party Conference?

S. Nikolayev, Moscow

G.K. Rebrov: It seems as if the Russian Party Conference will, at its very first sitting, be constituted as a constituent congress. At least this is what it is planned to do. Even so, none of this diminishes the importance of the Second Initiative Congress of Russia's Communists, due to be held in Leningrad 9-10 June, as regards the elaboration of Russian communists' position on fundamental questions of party building. Its delegates must express their attitude toward the drafts of the Central Committee platform and the CPSU Statute and elaborate a certain opinion on this issue. This is because the Russian Conference, due to open 19 June, is likely to see stormy debates on the entire broad range of questions and we must be prepared for this.

It so happens that I am simultaneously a member of the Russian Party Conference Preparatory Committee and a member of the Initiative Congress Organizational Bureau. But I think that this is logical—we are working on one and the same issue. I therefore believe that we must hold the Leningrad congress in an organized fashion, go there with fresh thoughts and ideas, think them through, and skillfully substantiate them so as to elaborate a united and clear-cut position on main questions of the Russian Communist Party's building. It is for this purpose that 28th congress delegates from Moscow City and Oblast and scientists and specialists from different spheres are currently meeting at the V.I. Lenin Museum. This approach ultimately enriches the very idea of creating a Russian Communist Party.

V.A. Tyulkin: I consider enlightenment and agitation work to be very important. We in Leningrad have also set up several groups of lecturers who address primary party organizations and labor collectives, telling them about the tasks of the initiative congresses—both the past one and the forthcoming one—and briefing people on the documents that have been adopted. This is yielding its results. We already have quite a few supporters. Of course, problems are unavoidable. There were instances when people from primary party organizations telephoned us to express dissatisfaction with speeches by certain lecturers: It was claimed that their agitation to create a Russian Communist Party "brings on heartburn." Therefore, our work among the masses must be done skillfully and thoughtfully, making sure that it produces its effect rather than scaring people off. In this regard, we pin great hopes on help and support from communists who have been elected delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

G.K. Rebrov: In this context, and on behalf of the Initiative Congress Organizational Committee, I would ask the Russian Federation delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress to attend our congress with full voting rights. We await them on 8 June in Leningrad, at the city party committee's Political Enlightenment House, where the registration of congress delegates will take place and questions of hotel accommodation will be decided. We hope that our joint work will be fruitful.

V.A. Tyulkin: I would like to emphasize that our Preparatory Committee has never opposed a single initiative committee or a single group working for the creation of the Russian Communist Party. On the contrary, when we first met on 3 April and the question of whether the Russian Communist Party would come into being was still not quite clear, we agreed that we would support all the movements in this direction, strengthening ties with them and collaborating on various issues. Therefore, the application of brakes and the "information blockage" which the idea of creating a Russian Communist Party encountered along its path and whose effects can still be felt to this day, should in no way be blamed on the Preparatory Committee. I think that this was a major success for party apparatus officials who still fear a "split."

V.M. Pashchenko: I personally sensed this apprehension when I returned home to Krasnoyarsk Kray after the first initiative congress. Some people perceived my trip to Leningrad as an illegal action. Fortunately, this did not last long. It is a highly indicative fact that a number of initiators of and participants in the Leningrad congress have now joined the Russian Party Conference Preparatory Committee. This proves that we are slowly but surely advancing along the path of unification and consolidation of all healthy Russian party forces.

G.K. Rebrov: I would like to draw attention to the following interesting detail. It is assumed that three-fourths of Russian Communist Party Central Committee members will be nominated at local level and only one-fourth will be elected at the party conference. Therefore, nobody is preventing participants in the initiative congress from nominating their own candidates for membership of the future Central Committee. This will surely boost the importance of the two forthcoming party forums—both the initiative congress and the party conference.

V.M. Pashchenko: I think that the conference of Russian communists will be a very important events in the CPSU's life. Despite a certain haste in its preparation, the documents which will be submitted for discussion by delegates are being thoroughly elaborated. I believe that we have all the opportunities to turn the forthcoming party forum into a consolidating one, to find through joint efforts a way out of the deadlock in which we have found ourselves. I am convinced that our party will get a second wind at the conference and the Russian Communist Party will head the Russian communists' further struggle for perestroyka.

Moscow Party Favors Russian Party 'Congress'

PM0506092390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by G. Ivanov-Smolenskiy: "Capital's City Committee on Eve of Congress"]

[Text] Moscow CPSU City Committee [Gorkom] First Secretary Yu. Prokofyev held a news conference on 31 May on the results of the Moscow communists' gorkom plenum.

The day before the press conference the plenum had discussed two documents—the city party organization's stance in the runup to the congress, and amendments to the CPSU Statutes. At the party conference it was decided to examine another three resolutions—"The CPSU and Young People," "The CPSU and the Soviets," and also "On the Creation of a Russian Communist Party." On the last item, Yu. Prokofyev noted, the opinion of gorkom members and rayon conferences was practically unanimous: The Russian conference, which is due to take place on 19 June, should be turned into a congress.

Party reform: A number of the amendments to the CPSU Statutes proposed by the Muscovites are fundamental—for example, on questions of democratic centralism and primary organizations' precedence over elected organs. The formation of platforms and currents within the party and the holding of referendums are permitted and direct, secret elections of leading organs in districts are proposed.

The first secretary stressed that if the 28th congress confines itself to applying a coat of varnish and making cosmetic changes in the party and fails to carry out its radical democratization, the CPSU is bound to lose its political perspective. But at the present moment it refuses to cooperate with other parties (there are around 15 in Moscow at the moment) because of their "anticommunist direction"—even though the new parties "would not have a social base" without that.

Whereas in the first four months of last year 2,484 people in Moscow left the CPSU, this year the figure was 11,148, and only 1,789 people joined instead of the usual 4,800 or thereabouts. According to the first secretary, only in certain cases were the reasons for leaving political; the main reasons were the fact that a career is no longer dependent on party membership and a rejection of the preprogrammed CPSU social structure. The forecast is that the process of CPSU defections will accelerate. But, despite this, Yu. Prokofyev is an advocate of an exchange of party cards after the 28th congress.

As for relations between the Moscow Gorkom and the Moscow Soviet, the first secretary said that they continue to be businesslike and constructive, especially with the leadership. However, he saw the recent decisions concerning MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and the ownership of rayon committee buildings as a purely political step that did not affect Muscovites' social condition: The new Moscow Soviet had needed to demonstrate "its supremacy." Meanwhile, the CPSU gorkom had offered the Moscow Soviet printing facilities and paper based on retail sales of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA. In principle, this paper could not be simultaneously the organ of the Moscow Soviet and the Moscow Gorkom since, as Yu. Prokofyev put it, a number of deputies had demanded at the session a "ban on professions for communists"—arguing that judges and state arbiters should leave the CPSU.

The CPSU leadership, the gorkom first secretary also said, had willy-nilly divorced the party from the elaboration and discussion of the program for swtiching to markey conditions. So it is difficult now to demand that the entire party bear responsibility for it and support it.

Moscow City Party Conference 14-15 June

LD0606130890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] The decision of the Moscow city CPSU committee plenum to hold a city party conference 14-15 June has added extra dynamism to the strenuous activity of Moscow's party organization. Active preparations are under way for this important party forum, which is to draw up a coordinated program for the capital's communists in the run-up to 28th CPSU Congress.

Leningrad Youth Newspaper Editor Interviewed

PM0606150390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 p 1

[Interview with Viktor Yugin, editor of Leningrad youth newspaper SMENA, by Yu. Filinov under rubric "Topical!": "On Short Rein"; first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Excerpts] Recently the country's youth publications have increasingly frequently been the target of criticism—from both the left and the right. What is the reason? That is the subject of this interview with RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy Viktor Yugin, editor of the Leningrad youth newspaper SMENA. [passage omitted]

[Yugin] The desire to change everything radically is constantly present in youth publications. Therefore, if you look round the country, "dismantlings" have been taking place primarily in youth publications. Leningrad is no exception. The same situation has taken place for us—in radio and television. After all many young people have also come there recently.

The relations of the party, soviet, and trade union leadership with the press became particularly aggravated after the election of USSR people's deputies, when the leaders of many Leningrad enterprises were rejected. Who was blamed at the time? Primarily the press. These accusations were quite tactless and humiliating for the journalists.

[Filinov] In what respect were they humiliating?

[Yugin] At the time we were given lists of candidates. They told us what to write about them, how often, and how favorably or critically...

[Filinov] And who gave these recommendations—the party obkom [oblast committee]?

[Yugin] Of course. For instance, we fought for Sobchak, Obolenskiy, Boldyrev, and Sychev. And, incidentally, they became deputies. But these names were not on the recommended lists. Nonetheless we wrote about them. This was our first clash with the Leningrad apparatus.

Later the obkom bureau decision on informal formations appeared. It stated that they were anti-Soviet and antisocialist groupings. And without any specific details. You must take it on trust! How simple it all was, after all. The same resolution warned the journalists who were communists that unless they performed explanatory work among their readers, unless they exposed the actions of these "antidemocratic" groupings, they would be personally answerable to the party. The result was that the journalist had to answer even for what he had not written. Just think: The groupings exist but I do not write about them, that means I must answer "to the party." The party organizations have been charged with examining the personal cases of those journalists and communists who "do not expose." Naturally, at the time this angered us, as it did candidate Deputy A. Yezhelev. We did a long interview him, completely "routing" the resolution. Naturally, this generated sympathy toward us on the one hand and on the other a certain hardness on the part of higher-ranking comrades from the apparatus. [passage omitted]

[Filinov] This is somewhat by the way, but I cannot help asking about your attitude toward the situation in Leningrad television.

[Yugin] My attitude is ambivalent.... There are many "buts" in this matter.... For instance, our television leader, Boris Petrov, did not have the right to that seat.

[Filinov] Why not?

[Yugin] He was approved only by an oblast soviet session. The Leningrad City Soviet session did not approve him. I think that under these conditions he should have resigned. But... he was put in by order and he began to work.

[Filinov] In ending our talk please tell me whether journalists are protected today against pressure and tyranny?

[Yugin] Not only are they not protected, they can even be dismissed. At any moment someone from the apparatus can decide to dismiss a journalist. You just try then to get the truth, to restore the truth. It is very complicated. A law on the press is absolutely essential. A law such that the press would indeed be the defender not only of man but also of democracy. And it should serve them alone.

Western Republics

Moldavia Passes Law Against Civil Disobedience

LD0606210890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Moldavian republic has passed laws which increase responsibility for law and order in the republic.

[Correspondent I. Petkov] The parliament of the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldova—as Moldavia is now called—continued the formation of its government today. The approval of the minister of internal affairs is being dragged out, and, as deputies here say, it is this department that especially has much work on its hands now. In a number of towns and rayons the local soviets are disregarding some republican laws and are fighting for the formation of autonomous territories. In this connection, the session adopted a number of amendments to the constitution and new laws. I quote in particular: Persons impeding fulfilment of the requirements of the constitution and other laws through open civil disobedience as well as by appeals for mass disobedience are punished by imprisonment of up to 3-7 years,

or fines of thousands of rubles. This applies both to organizations and to the press. Outrages against national symbols, both of the union and the republic, are strictly punished.

[Begin recording of Petkov interviewing Moldavian People's Deputy M. Gimpu] The parliament's new decisions, it must be assumed, are aimed above all at not permitting a further escalation of interethnic tension, especially about territorial demarcation in Moldavia?

[Gimpu] I fully agree with you. I'll tell you in a couple of words that the historical fact must be taken into account that we have lived, are living, and will live together. The laws that are being passed by the state are not simply someone's whims. They are always dictated by life. [end recording]

Donetsk Coal Workers To Hold Congress

LD0506201190 Moscow TASS in English 2004 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Donetsk June 5 TASS—by TASS correspondents Anatoliy Gordeyev and Vladimir Yurkevich:

Soviet miners will hold their congress in Donetsk, southeastern Ukraine, between June 11-15. Last summer, striking miners demanded to convene such a congress.

Leaders of the strike movement took the option in protest against the decision of the Soviet Coal Industry Workers Trade Union central council's plenary meeting, held ten days ago, which scheduled a similar congress for August in Moscow. Delegations of several coal mining regions have already confirmed their participation in the Donetsk congress.

The congress' agenda includes discussions of prospects for the coal industry in the Soviet Union and work in conditions of a market economy, miners' social status and the realisation of the government regulation adopted after last year's strikes.

Participants in the congress are also expected to discuss a possibility to set up a miners association within the framework of the Soviet Coal Industry Workers Trade Union.

Ukraine Supreme Soviet 1st Deputy Chairman Elected

LD0706112190 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Excerpts] We begin with a report on the work of the session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine of the 12th convocation. Today's session discussed candidates for the post of deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine. Taking into account the important functions to be carried out by them, naturally the deputies manifested not only an interest in their programs, how weighty and scientifically grounded they are, but aspired to discover the business and human qualities of the contenders themselves.

Of course, there was a falling out of step. From the very beginning, representatives of the Democratic Bloc spoke before their colleagues, parliamentarians of the Ukraine, with a statement. In it in part they expressed their dissatisfaction with the fact that allegedly the leadership of the Supreme Soviet is being formed with the [word indistinct] orders of the party apparatus; and proceeding from this, the Democratic Bloc has refused to vote for the candidates nominated by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine, Vladimir Ivashko, for the post of his first deputy. The Democratic Bloc stated that it remains in the opposition to the overwhelming majority of deputies, which, in its opinion, are expressing the interests of the party apparatus in the Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

As a result of the voting by secret ballot, none of the candidates for the post of first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet received the required majority of votes, but after repeated voting, Ivan Plyushch was elected first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine.

Caucasus

Passport Checks, Violence in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD0506212890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A report by our correspondent tells of the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] of Azerbaijan. [Video shows armored vehicles and armed soldiers in city, people going about their business, soldiers shown checking documents. A voice is heard calling over a loudspeaker that documents are being checked in the rayon]

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] We arrived in the oblast center of Stepanakert when units of interior troops, together with the local law enforcement bodies, were carrying out a passport check in the city—that is a forced measure, but a necessary one. Such an operation is provided for by the law of the USSR on the legal regime of the state of emergency. And here is just a small part of the weapons, ammunition, and explosives siezed by the interior troops. [Video shows closeup of weapons and ammunition, then switches to interview]

[Correspondent] Well, what is the operational situation in the NKAO now?

[V.V. Ogorodnikov, chief of the operational group of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs] A week ago there were serious incidents in the Mardakertskiy Rayon connected with the column which was travelling from Mir-Bashir to Kelbadzhar. And, well, there were practically mass disturbances there. Thirty-six motor vehicles were smashed. Moreover, some of them were smashed in such a way that they cannot be restored.

[Correspondent] Comrade Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, first secretary of the republic's communist party Central Committee, came to Stepanakert. He awarded certificates of honor of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and medals for excellent service in protecting public order. [video shows award ceremony]

Weapons Confiscated

LD0606175990 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Shulman]

[Text] Stepanakert June 6 TASS—Identity check-ups and weapons confiscation are under way in the administrative centre of Nagorno-Karabakh, Stepanakert, in keeping with the USSR law on the state of emergency in the disputed region.

"We are operating within the constitutional framework, without infringing the rights and interests of citizens," said police Major-General Vyacheslav Ogorodnikov, head of a Soviet Interior Ministry operations group.

Since the imposition of the state of emergency in Nagorno-Karabakh, the group alone confiscated 225 fire arms, 89 grenades, 22 mines and more than 9,000 rounds of ammunition.

A total of 445 people were detained for failing to present documents or having no permament or temporary residence permits.

Interior Ministry troops and the operations group established control over all transportation networks in the autonomous region. Measures are being undertaken to prevent militants' stockpiles, already noticeably depleted by now, from contributing to fresh outbreaks of violence and provocations against servicemen and civilians.

Arrival of Military Equipment in Yerevan Reported

LD0606143190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] The POST FACTUM [not further identified] news agency announced that a considerable amount of military equipment arrived at the capital city of Armenia. Helicopters are constantly flying over the city. No more official information specifying the amount of military equipment brought in or other facts has been made available so far.

Correspondent Reports on Armenian Paramilitaries

LD0606213490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Legal paramilitary formations are being created in Armenia. Our Special Correspondent Aleksandr Barkhatov reports: [video shows man standing beside military vehicles in a courtyard]

[Barkhatov] Probably no one could now answer the simple question of how many public organizations there are in Yerevan and how many of them have their own armed formations. Anyway, without any form of concealment, we have come here—to the headquarters of the Armenian National Army—and, without any form of concealment, they have shown us what there is and have allowed us to meet the men. [Video shows building with a red, blue and orange flag; men in uniform talking in the courtyard]

One may, perhaps, regard the very fact that an inquisitive journalist was shown samples of the weapons of the headquarters duty officer as proof of the trusting tone of the meeting here. [Video shows man in uniform with pistol]

[R.A. Vasilyan, chairman of the Military Council of the "Armenian National Army"] The pistols are homemade. The assault rifles are all training weapons that have been sawn off and welded. Basically we already have a principle: that is, they're for defending the border. Our weapons are basically in the former border barracks.

[Barkhatov] I believe that, according to the latest bulletins, something like 1,000 combat small arms are in circulation somewhere around the republic. If they don't belong to you, whose are they?

[Vasilyan] There are a number of people who have armed themselves, well, for their own purposes and so on. Well, we have an order: If those people don't want to join and take orders, we'll disarm them.

[Barkhatov] Apart from the badges, is there any, as it were, documentary indication that people belong to your army?

[Vasilyan] Yes. I can show you my military card. [Video shows a small booklet with a blue cover; inside there is a red, blue and orange page bearing Vasilyan's photograph]

[Barkhatov] Each one has a photograph, does it?

[Vasilyan] Yes, a photograph and a stamp. [Video shows Barkhatov talking to uniformed men in the courtyard]

[Barkhatov] Could you find the forces that are engaged in inciting, like what happened on 27 May?

[Unidentified speaker] That's the mafia—the mafia. The mafia that has been around for 70 years and still exists today. They don't want the democratization of our country or our republic. They're against the people. [video shows meeting with men in a room]

[Barkhatov] Today, the question is whether it is possible, through political methods, to secure firm control over the armed formations that have come into being spontaneously was discussed at a meeting between journalists

and representatives of the Armenian Council of Ministers and the republic's Communist Party.

Armenian Movement Cited on Crisis Solution

LD0606101890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The recent incidents in Yerevan, a fresh outburst of emotion, have complicated the situation in the republic. It is very important now that the Armenian public consolidate and prevent further aggravation of the situation.

[Begin recording] [Reporter A. Barkhatov] Of course, one can't yet speak of unity among Armenia's social forces, but nevertheless, the republic's situation is forcing the best known public organizations, including the Armenian National Movement, to seek specific proposals and ways to emerge from the crisis that could put the republic on the verge of extraordinary measures, including introducing a state of emergency.

Isn't there now a process under way in the republic whereby the armed formations previously controlled by your organizations are becoming uncontrollable, and weapons are perhaps also coming in through certain other people?

[F.P. Safaryan, chairman of the public organization Armenian National Preparliament (Armyanskiy Natsionalnyy Predparlament)] If we legalize all these militia subunits, troops, we thereby would be creating a way to confiscate weapons from the criminal elements through these legalized organizations. Things are very bad because of military intervention from outside. The situation is fraught with great danger, I believe.

[Barkhatov] Incidentally, the idea of creating some public formations to help the forces for maintaining order in the city and republic is not new. It was dealt with in an Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium decision, published in May, which is called, literally: On the formation of nonprofessional public formations to prevent violations of the law and to protect public order.

[A.A. Gevorkyan, procurator of the Armenian SSR] There is a Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR decision and Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Armenian SSR decision on the expediency of establishing at the Supreme Soviet a National Security Council. The groups which join this Council will be considered legal. The groups that do not join it already are regarded illegal, and the Supreme Soviet Presidium decision provides for eliminating these groups.

[Barkhatov] Procuracy and public organizations representatives already have started discussing the National Security Council's composition and structure. [end recording] [video shows street scenes, speakers to camera]

Flights Between Armenia, NKAO Curtailed

NC0606120790 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Yerebuni Airport is packed with concerned stranded passangers and sleepless children lying on the (?ground) and [words indistinct]. Over the general din, the loudspeaker announces that ticket sales for the 6 and 7 June Yerevan-Stepanakert flight have been canceled. [Words indistinct] people ask if they could fly to Stepanakert with the tickets purchased on 1 June.

This is the situation that has prevailed here for the past few days, writes the paper's correspondent Samuel [name indistinct]. People waste days at the airport. They arrive here in the morning with children and belongings, wait there until evening, leave and return the next day.

Commenting on the situation, the director of the airport, Badalyan, said: With the commencement of the summer schedule we had planned to introduce nine flights from Yerevan to Stepanakert, in view of the fact that we have such a capacity and the right to organize such flights. We have a cable—he shows it—from the deputy chairman of the USSR Civil Aviation Department saying that under the conditions of economic independence the number of flights is determined by the Armenian Civil Aviation Department.

There is also the Yegvard Airport from which Stepanakert Airport used to take directives. However, a cable from Stepanakert Airport says: considering the state of emergency in NKAO, the number of flights must be curtailed and more than (?seven) flights will be considered illegal. This order came from military commandant Safonov and the die-hard Armenian-hater Polyanichko. The commandant has ordered that a crew making more than (?seven) flights is liable to pay 1,000 rubles or serve a 15-day prison term. Already such a punishment was meted out on 28 May and only through the intervention of the USSR's Ministry of Civil Aviation did Safonov consent to set the crew free.

At the orders of the commandant, all helicopter flights have been terminated. Even the flights from Ghapan and Leninakan are considered illegal. Flights were organized from Sisyan and Goris to Mardakert but these flights are also (?now cancelled).

As you can see, continues Badalyan, under these conditions our possibilities are limited.

The reporter concludes by saying: I do not know how to characterize the illegal, illogical, and immoral destruction of the entire airstrip of Mardakert Airport on 15 May by the soldiers on Safonov's orders. Who in this country has given him such latitude? Is the commandant appointed to uphold legality or to trample upon it? [Words indistinct] arbitrariness has become the ruling force.

Seizure of Tanks Reported in Armenia

NC1905105690 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 18 May 90

[Statement issued by the Internal Affairs Ministry of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic and by the military commandant of Yerevan Garrison; place and date not given]

[Text] At around 0600 on 18 May, a group of armed persons seized 16 tanks that were going from Kanaker to Masis railway station to undergo modernization procedures and then to redeploy according to plan.

Another armed group in Masisskiy rayon stole five tanks from the railway platform at 1130 and took them to Artashatskiy Rayon.

The attackers behaved audaciously, issuing threats at gunpoint and taking the tank drivers hostage.

The commandant of the army units and republic's law enforcement bodies took appropraite measures to prevent the use of the stolen technology for criminal purposes and to forestall a direct clash with the army units.

A brief exchange of fire in the neighborhood of the Komitas Public Gardens was brought to an end. After negotiations the tanks were returned to their deployment areas. There were no casualties. The army servicemen displayed a high degree of restraint and patience, thus averting any bloodshed. However, the attackers and the citizens of the republic must realize that such incidents could have tragic consequences for innocent people who might by chance find themselves on the scene.

The republic's procuracy has instituted criminal proceedings in connection with the incident.

Armenian Decision on Republican President

LD1605141390 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 4 May 90 p 1

[Text] Decision by the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet on the Establishment of the Post of President of the Armenian SSR and Making Amendments and Additions to the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Armenian SSR

In connection with the establishement of the post of president of the Armenian SSR and the introduction of amendments and additions to the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Armenian SSR, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet decides:

1. To instruct the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Issues of Legislation and Socialist Legality to formulate a draft Armenian SSR Law within five days and present it for the examination of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet.

2. To hold the election of the Armenian SSR president by citizens of the Armenian SSR on the basis of universal, equal, and direct voting by secret ballot within two months of the adoption of this law.

[Signed] G. Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
N. Stepanyan, secretary of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
Yerevan, 3 May 1990

Armenia Drafts Laws on Presidential Post

NC1805085490 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 16 May 90

[Text] Yerevan, 16 May (ARMENPRES)—The Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has met under Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian SSR's Supreme Soviet Presidium. In fulfillment of the instructions of the 12th extraordinary session of the Armenian SSR's Supreme Soviet on the establishment of the post of president, it took cognizance of the fact that, with the participation of experts, Armenian SSR draft laws "on the establishment of the post of president of the Armenian SSR and the introduction of amendments and additions to the Armenian SSR's Constitution (Basic Law)" and "on the elections for the president of the Armenian SSR" have been formulated at the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Armenian SSR."

In view of the importance of this matter, the presidium considered it appropriate to publish the aforesaid draft laws in the republican press within 10 days, for public debate. It was decided that, within a month from the date of the publication of the draft laws in the press, the proposals and criticisms made during the public debate should be summarized and, after reformulation, submitted to the consideration of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR.

Trains Unload in Armenia After Blockade

NC1605142090 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 15 May 90

[Text] The fourth blockade of the republic has ended. The Azerbaijani side opened the railways two weeks ago, and trains which had been stranded on Nakhichevan territory for almost a month are entering Armenia one after another.

The arrival of these trains is putting a strain on all stations, especially the Yerevan station. Freight cars are arriving at a pace which far exceeds earlier norms and must be parked, unloaded in a timely manner, and returned to circulation. The Yerevan station workers and the collectives of all organizations which benefit from the rail service are doing all they can to unload each freight car in a timely fashion and store the goods being received to prevent rail bottlenecks and ensure the arrival of as many trains as possible in Armenia. This is

an imperative necessity because the behavior of our neighbor does not inspire confidence that the blockade will not be repeated.

Nagorgno-Karabakh Road Construction Noted

NC1605143790 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 15 May 90

[Text] Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO] is aware of the support of the fatherland and is unflinchingly maintaining its will for freedom. While not abandoning the political struggle, we must also pursue a sensible economic policy. The republic's ministry of road construction and maintenance undertook large-scale work in 1989 and is continuing this work. There is no need to speak about what has been and will be accomplished nor about the difficulties which arise in reaching the desired goal. Suffice it to mention that road construction projects worth 3 million rubles have been carried out there. An outlay of R4-5 million is envisaged for this year.

Armenian Party Leader Visits Quake Zone

NC1605144390 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 15 May 90

[Text] Vladimir Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, held a consultative meeting in Spitak with ministers and department heads of the Armenian Republic and with the leaders of republican and construction organizations working in Spitak. The party economic aktiv of Spitakskiy Rayon also particpated in the meeting.

Opening the meeting, Vladimir Movsisyan stressed that the numerous problems connected with the revival of the disaster zone have not been solved by the union-level organizations and by the departments and organizations of our republic for a variety of reasons. At present, the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and government are taking radical measures to speed up work in the disaster zone, particularly in Spitak Rayon. The Armenian leadership has sent an appeal to the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers requesting that they conduct an in-depth examination of the course of the implementation of the relevant decisions and endorse a new construction plan for the Armenian Republic.

Furthermore, the first secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee noted, we have a large pool of labor resources now available and if problems related to financing, provision of material-technical goods, and technical equipment are resolved in a concrete manner then it will be possible to enlarge and upgrade our republic's building industry.

The meeting decided to set up an operational committee which will oversee the implementation of the instructions of the State Committee on Special Situations attached to the USSR Council of Ministers.

Nakichevan Party Conference Examines Situation

LD1305230790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 13 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A city party report back and election conference took place today in the city of Nakhichevan, the capital of the Azerbaijani autonomous republic of the same name.

[M.Mamedov] The Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic is in a complicated economic situation at present. The losses from the road and rail blockade amount to tens of millions of rubles. Now that goods trains have begun to arrive again it would be a good thing if these losses were made up. But, unfortunately, the alarming reports about attacks, explosions, and arsons from the areas bordering Armenia are creating a very tense atmosphere in which it is becoming increasingly difficult not just to work, but even to live normally.

This was the main point of discussion at a party conference of Nakhichevan communists. It was noted that the working people are justifiably criticizing the union and republican leadership which has so far done too little to normalize the situation in the region. At this difficult time the party city committee is most frequently behind the events which are taking place. The party leaders lack militancy and adherence to principle and, as a result, 800 people have left the CPSU. Those who spoke stressed that it is only by specific deeds, not by slogans and appeals, that it will be possible to raise the prestige of the party organization and regain the trust of the working people.

[Begin recording] [A.N. Mutalibov, Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee first secretary] This is my second day in the autonomous republic. I have had an opportunity to meet the residents of the border villages of Sadarak, (Charchi), and (Dzhernachartak). What should I say? The situation there is exactly like that on the front lines. We assured communists that the country's leadership, the country's president, the republican leadership and the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee will do everything to normalize the situation in the near future and that they will do everything to ensure peace and calm in that territory.

[Mamedov] But what will be done to boost the economy of this area?

[Mutalibov] I think we should consider the possibility of adopting a special decision providing for the mobilization of all of the republic's resources. I presume that the center will help us in this too. [Video shows street scenes, ruined house, auditorium and Mutalibov facing camera]